



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

.G
10



A
PRESERVATIVE AGAINST POPERY,

IN SEVERAL

Select Discourses

UPON THE

PRINCIPAL HEADS OF CONTROVERSY

BETWEEN

PROTESTANTS AND PAPISTS:

BEING WRITTEN AND PUBLISHED

By the most eminent Divines of the Church of England,

CHIEFLY IN THE REIGN OF KING JAMES II.

COLLECTED BY

THE RIGHT REV. EDMUND GIBSON, D.D.

SUCCESSIVELY LORD BISHOP OF LINCOLN AND LONDON,

[B. 1669, D. 1748.]

CAREFULLY REVISED AND EDITED

FOR THE BRITISH SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING THE RELIGIOUS PRINCIPLES
OF THE REFORMATION,

BY

THE REV. JOHN CUMMING, D.D.

VOL. XIII.

LONDON:

PUBLISHED AT THE SOCIETY'S OFFICE,

8, EXETER HALL, STRAND.

1848.

20

English
Pickering
6-14-28
17540

7-9-28 H. A. II.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XIII.

THE DOCTRINES IN DISPUTE BETWEEN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND THE CHURCH OF ROME, TRULY REPRESENTED.—(Continued.)

	PAGE
IV.—An Answer to the Reply, etc. being a further Defence of the Exposition of the Doctrine of the Church of England. By Dr. WAKE, Archbishop of Canterbury	1
V.—The Difference between the Church of England and the Church of Rome, in opposition to a late book, entitled, an Agreement between the Church of England and the Church of Rome. By Dr. WILLIAMS, late Bishop of Chichester.	15
VI.—The Doctrines and Practices of the Church of Rome truly represented; in answer to a book, entitled, a Papist Misrepresented and Represented, etc. By Dr. STILLINGFLEET, late Bishop of Worcester	208
VII.—A View of the whole Controversy between the Representer and the Answerer; with an Answer to the Representer's last Reply, in which are laid open some of the Methods by which Protestants are misrepresented by Papists. By Dr. CLAGETT, late Preacher of Gray's Inn	323



THE
DOCTRINES IN DISPUTE
BETWEEN THE
CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND THE CHURCH OF ROME
TRULY REPRESENTED.

AN ANSWER TO THE REPLY,
ETC.

BEING A FURTHER DEFENCE OF THE EXPOSITION OF THE
DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

THE INTRODUCTION.

It was the opinion of a late author concerning a very short treatise that he had published upon most of the points in controversy between us and the Church of Rome ; that though he had neither put himself to the expense of any new arguments against us, nor produced the authority of either ancient Fathers, or even of modern writers, to back his assertions, he had, nevertheless, answered in that one treatise, not only all those late discourses that had just before been published by our divines on those subjects, but a great part of all the books and sermons that had ever been writ or preached against his Church. Though I am not very fond of following any copy which that author can set me, and in this especially do think his vanity so ridiculous, that he is rather to be pitied than imitated ; yet being once more called upon, for a further vindication of myself, to another review of the most considerable articles wherein we differ from those of the other communion, I cannot but observe, that not only my present adversary has not advanced in this new attempt one jot beyond what I

had before confuted, but that in all their books their whole business is merely to transcribe one another ; so that from the Bishop of Condom's Exposition,* even to the Eye Catechism,† there is nothing new ; but the same answer that is made to one, does really in effect overthrow them all.

2. It is this has put me upon the troublesome design, not only of resuming and collating the Bishop of Meaux's Exposition, and the Vindication of it, with the Reply that is now before me on every Article ; but to search all those other treatises that have been published since the Representer first broke the peace with us : to convince the world that matters are now driven as far as they can go ; so that in reading any one of their books they may really find as much, as when they shall have taken the pains to consult them all. If this will not engage them to produce something more than they have yet done to answer our arguments, it shall at least, I hope, excuse us, if we from henceforth dispense with ourselves the trouble of large confutations ; so that instead of transcribing again our own books, as often as they shall please to furnish out a new title to their old objections, we shall need only to direct them to those replies that have been already made, and in which their pretensions have been confuted before they were published.

3. It was the complaint of St. Augustine‡ against such kind of antagonists as these in his time, " that whether out of too much blindness, by which even the clearest things are not seen ; or out of an obstinate stubbornness, whereby even those things which are seen are not endured, they would defend their own unreasonable notions after a full answer had been given to them, as if it were reason and truth itself that they maintained. —And therefore (says he) what end shall there be of disputing, what measure of speaking, if we must always answer those that answer us ? For they who either cannot understand what is said, or are so hardened with a spirit of opposition, that though they did understand, yet would they not submit : they answer, as it is written, and they speak iniquity, and are indefatigably vain. Whose contrary sayings, if we should as often refute, as they have resolved with an invincible forehead not to care what they say, so they do but by any means con-

* See the Reply, Pref. p. 6.

† The original whereof was first published in Spanish, anno 1616.

‡ St. Austin. de Civit. Dei, l. 2. c. 1. [vol. 7. p. 31. Par. 1685.]

tradict our disputations; who does not see how infinite, and troublesome, and fruitless this would be?"

THE ANSWER TO THE FIRST ARTICLE.

You will excuse, Sir, this little address to my reader; I shall from henceforth keep close to your Reply,* and notwithstanding St. Augustine's insinuation to the contrary, attend you once more whithersoever you shall please to lead me. And to shew how exactly applicable what I have before said of your books in general, is to your Reply above any in particular; the first observation I have to make is, that for what concerns the common cause of religion in this first article, you have entirely taken, or rather indeed stolen it (since I do not remember that you have once mentioned your author) out of T. G.'s Discourse against Dr. Stillingfleet, and which that most learned man had fully answered some years since. And yet you neither take notice of his answers, nor offer any one thing to prevent the same replies from being made by me to the same objections.

2. You begin your Vindication† with a scandalous charge of "calumnies, misrepresentations," &c. This you persist in in your Reply,‡ and so does T. G.§ against his adversary. "He tells him how in the prosecution of his argument, he should be forced to lay open his frequent contradictions, calumnies, and misrepresentations;" by which the reader may now see that you meant me no harm in all these hard words against me; but you found them in your author, and you transcribed the railing with as little judgment as you have done the reasoning of his books. After this short and civil preface, you tell me,

3. Ad p. 2.] Reply.¶ "That there was a time in which the genuine sons of the Church of England¶ excused the Roman Catholic Church of that odious imputation of idolatry, and *some* of them (never excommunicated ** nor censured by the Church of England for it) maintained, that we cannot defend the charge of idolatry against the Church of Rome without denying that Church to be a true Church, and by consequence without contradicting ourselves, and going against the intention of the Reformation, which was not to make a new

* Reply, p. 1.

† Vindic. p. 22.

‡ Reply, p. 2.

§ T. G.'s first Answ. pref. p. 3.

¶ Reply, p. 2.

¶ T. G.'s first Answ. pref. p. 15.

** T. G.'s second Answ. p. 15.

Church, but to restore a sick Church to its soundness, a corrupt Church to its purity," &c. (*See T. G. first Answer, Pref. p. 7.*)

Answ.] Had you but ingenuously owned from whence you had taken this objection against our Church, the reader would presently have known whither to have gone for the confutation of it. But seeing you are resolved to make it your own, I shall answer two things:

First, That what you have said is false.

Secondly, That you either did or ought to have known it to be so.

4. First, It is false, that those whom from T. G. you are pleased to style the genuine sons of the Church of England have excused your Church of that odious imputation of idolatry, or by consequence did think that we could not defend it against you without contradicting ourselves, and going against the intention of the Reformation.

5. Your first author is Dr. Jackson;* and he is so far from excusing you in this point, as you most wretchedly assert, that in a set discourse, under this very title, "Of the identity or equivalency of Superstition in Rome Heathen and Rome Christian,"† he spends above seventeen sheets on purpose to prove the charge of idolatry upon you: and answers all your evasions, by which you endeavour in vain to clear yourselves of the guilt of it. The very subject of his first chapter is to shew, "that Rome Christian in latter years sought rather to allay than to abrogate the idolatry of Rome Heathen," p. 933. In his twenty-fifth chapter, having mentioned that conclusion of your Church, "that saints are to be worshipped with religious worship,"‡ he pronounces sentence against you in these very words, "this we say is formal idolatry." The title of his twenty-seventh chapter is positive, "that the same expression of our respect or observance towards saints or angels locally present, cannot without superstition or idolatry be made to them in their absence."§ And in the twenty-eighth chapter, speaking of your form of commending a departing soul:

("Depart out of this world in the name of God the Father Almighty, who hath created thee,|| in the name of Jesus Christ

* Dr. Jackson, see his Works, 3 vol. fol. Lond. an. 1673.

† Tom. 1.

‡ Page 946.

§ Ibid. p. 954.

|| Ibid. p. 961.

the Son of God,* who suffered for thee; in the name of the Holy Ghost, who was poured forth upon thee; in the name of angels and archangels; in the name of thrones and dominions; in the name of principalities and powers; in the name of cherubims and seraphims; in the name of patriarchs and prophets; in the name of holy apostles and evangelists; in the name of holy martyrs and confessors; in the name of holy monks and hermits; in the name of virgins, and of all God's saints and saintesses; this day let thy soul be in peace, and thy habitation in holy Zion.")

"If (says he) thus they pray with their lips only, they mock God as well as the saints. If thus they pray with internal affection of heart and spirit, they really worship saints with the self-same honour wherewith they honour God.—They might with less impiety admit a Christian soul into the Church militant, than translate it into the Church triumphant in other names besides the Trinity. They might better baptize them only in the name of God the Father, and of St. Francis, St. Benedict, and St. Dominick, &c., without any mention of God the Son, and Holy Ghost, rather than join these, as commissioners with them in dismissing souls out of their bodies. To censure this part of their Liturgy as it deserves, it is no prayer, but a *charm*, conceived out of the dregs and relics of *heathenish idolatry*, which cannot be brought forth but in *blasphemy*, nor be applied to any sick soul without *sorcery*."†

6. This is the first of our Churchmen that you say excused you from the odious imputation of idolatry. And since I perceive his authority is of some weight with you, as being one of the genuine sons of the Church of England, which T. G. would not allow his adversary, nor it may be will you therefore esteem me to be; I hope you will for his sake, who here charges your offices with *charms* and *sorcery*, as well as with superstition and idolatry, be from henceforth a little more favourable to my reflection on another occasion of your *magical incantations*.‡

7. I have been detained a little longer than I designed in this

* Breviarium Roman. de Ord. Commendationis animæ Deo. [Pars. Vern. p. ccxlvii. Mechlin. 1836.]

† See more in express words, c. 24. §. 8. p. 943; c. 27. § 2. p. 956. tom. i.

‡ Which he also in express words charges your adoration of the cross with, c. 24. §. 4. p. 941. Oper. tom. i.

first author; but I will make amends for it, by referring you for the three next* to the like account which Dr. Stillingfleet† gave to your friend T. G. from their own words: as for Mr. Thorndike,‡ it is confessed he was once in the opinion that you mention, but you knew very well that he changed his mind before his death. You may see by an extract that has lately been published out of his will,§ what an ill notion he had of your Church in general, and for the point before us, T. G.'s reverend and learned adversary eight years ago published a paper from Mr. Thorndike's own hand, || in which, among other exceptions against you, he makes this his twelfth: "To pray to saints departed for those things which only God can give (*as all Papists do*), is by the proper sense of their words *downright idolatry*. If they say their meaning is by a figure, only to desire them to procure their requests of God: how dare any Christian trust his soul with that Church which teaches that which must needs be *idolatry* in all that understand not the figure?"

8. Such was the just judgment of this learned and pious man in this matter. If after this it be necessary to say any thing to his former opinion, I will only observe, that the ground of it was this mistake, *viz.* "that the Christian Church, without renouncing the profession of the true God, cannot be guilty of *idolatry*."¶ Now this Cardinal Bellarmine himself,** and others of your Church do utterly deny; "for (says he) it is idolatry, not only when one adores an idol, leaving God, but also when an idol is adored together with God."

9. The last of our divines whom you cite as excusing you from idolatry, is the Rev. Dr. Hammond:†† but your falseness is as notorious in him as in all the rest. For in a particular Discourse of Idolatry, sect. 44, he approves and explains the design of our Homilies against the Peril of Idolatry. Sect. 50. He says, "that your worshipping of images in the most mo-

* Dr. Field. Archbishop Laud. Dr. Heylin.

† See in the preface to his first book concerning the Idolatry of the Christian Religion, and his general preface to the several late Treatises, &c. Lond. 1673.

‡ Mr. Thorndike.

§ Mr. Pulton considered. Lond. 1687.

|| Dr. Stillingfleet's Conferences against T. G. Lond. 1679. p. 89.

¶ Just Weights and Measures, p. 6. Edit. Lond. 1662. cap. 1.

** De Imag. lib. 2. cap. 24. p. 2153. [Ingolst. 1586.]

†† Dr. Hammond Pract. Disc. Lond. 1674. §. 44. p. 351.

derate way that can be, is for aught he knows, a kind of idol-worship, but, to be sure, a prohibited act.”* Sect. 54. “That to put up those petitions to the blessed Virgin which are terminated in herself (as many forms, if not her whole office may appear to be), are acts parallel to the old idolatry.”† Sect. 56. “That your worshipping of images, notwithstanding all your distinctions of worshipping God *mediante imagine*, or *relative*, &c. is idolatry.”‡ Sect. 64. “That the worship of the bread in the sacrament must certainly be idolatry.§ That your error about transubstantiation, and your good design of worshipping Christ there may, he hopes, be some excuse for you ; but that your opinion will not hinder it from being at least material idolatry, and the worshipping of something that is not God.”

10. So that now upon the whole it remains, that there is not so much as a shadow of truth in your assertion, that “the true and genuine sons of the Church of England have excused your Church of the odious imputation of idolatry.” My next business is to shew, that you did, or ought to have known, that there was not one word of truth in what you said.

11. Now this will depend upon the answer which I shall leave any honest man to give to these two plain questions. 1. Whether when you stole all this out of T. G. you either did not, or ought not to have known, that Dr. Stillingfleet had answered all these cavils many years since, and shewn that there was no truth or sincerity in them? 2. Whether a man that quotes but six authors for an assertion derogatory to the establishment of their Church, and contrary to the public doctrine of the Homilies and Injunctions, and to the private opinions of the generality of the divines of it, ought not to have been sure that those authors at least did affirm that which he pretends they did? The latter of these will conclude against you, that you ought to have known that what you here say is false, because you ought to have examined these authors, and then you would have known it to be so. And for the former (were not your conscience unfit to be appealed to in a matter of truth against yourself), I durst appeal to your own soul, whether you did not know that the learned man I have so often mentioned, had shewn T. G. how false these pretences were? But I go on with you to your next paragraph; where you tell me,

* Sect. 50. p. 353, 354.

† Sect. 56. p. 355.

‡ Sect. 54. p. 354.

§ Sect. 64. p. 357.

12. Ad. p. 2.] *Reply.* "You would gladly know, wherefore at this time I charge you with the odious imputation of adoring men and women, crosses and images," &c.

Ans.] To satisfy you in which demand, I reply, 1. That I charge you with this, because it is true, and I have both shewn it already, and will yet farther shew it to be so. 2. I do it at this time, because at this time you have the confidence to deny it, nay, to charge us with calumny and misrepresentation for having ever accused you of it. So that your wise question is in effect but this: We the Vindicators and Representatives of New Popery have publicly exposed you to the world as a pack of knaves that have misrepresented our doctrine, and wherefore do you go about to vindicate yourselves, and not suffer us to make silly people believe in quiet that what we say is true?

13. *Ibid.*] *Reply.* "Where (say you) do I find any thing of this in the Thirty-nine Articles? and for the book of Homilies, I must be little versed in our own doctrine not to know that several eminent divines of our own Church do not allow that book to contain in every part of it the dogmatical doctrine of the Church of England." (Thus T. G. speaks into your mouth, and you, as his engine, echo them to us. T. G.'s first Answer to Dr. Stillingfleet, Preface, p. 8, 9.)

Ans.] Now to this you should have known that Dr. Stillingfleet gave this answer: "That the Articles of our Church have confirmed those Homilies; that these Articles were not only allowed and approved by the Queen, but subscribed by the whole clergy in convocation, Anno 1571. Now (says the Dean) I desire T. G. to resolve me, whether men of any common understanding would have subscribed to this book of Homilies in this manner, if they had believed the main doctrine and design of one of them had been false and pernicious, as they must have done, if they had thought the practice of the Roman Church to be free from idolatry. I will put the case that any of the bishops then had thought that the charge of idolatry had been unjust, and that it had subverted the foundation of ecclesiastical authority; that there could have been no Church or right of ordination, if the Roman Church had been guilty of idolatry; would they have inserted this into the Articles when it was in their power to have left it out? and that the Homilies contained a wholesome and godly doctrine, which in their consciences they believed to be false and pernicious? I might as well think that the Council of Trent

would have allowed Calvin's Institutions as containing a wholesome and godly doctrine, as that men so persuaded would have allowed it the Homily against the Peril of Idolatry."*

14. For your objection from T. G.† "that several eminent divines of our Church do not allow that book to contain in every part of it the public dogmatical doctrine of the Church of England," and three of whose names (from T. G. still) you adorn your margin with, he answers: "Be it so. Surely there is a great deal of difference between some particular passages and expressions in these Homilies, and that which is the main design and foundation of one of them. But in this case we are to observe, that they who deny the Church of Rome to be guilty of idolatry, do not only look on the charge as false, but as of dangerous consequence, and therefore, although men may subscribe to a book in general as containing wholesome and godly doctrine, though they be not so certain of the truth of every passage in it, yet they can never do it with a good conscience, if they believe any great and considerable part of the doctrine therein contained, to be false and dangerous."‡

15. Thus did this reverend person confute your oracle. If you had offered any thing to prevent the same answer from being returned to you, I should have been far from complaining against you for advancing of an old argument with new strength; but when you saw how unable T. G.§ was to defend these cavils, nevertheless still to produce them; and though you could not but be conscious to yourself at the same time that they were not to be maintained; I shall only say, that it serves to convince me of the truth of what an ancient Greek poet once observed, and the meaning of whose words you may inquire among the learned at your leisure: *οὐκ ἔστ' ἀναιδούνε ζῶον εὐθαρσέστερον*.

16. Ad p. 3.] *Reply*. Your next paragraph consists of a story of Queen Elizabeth, and that too echoed from T. G.'s inspiration;|| but to this I have already returned my answer, and when you think fit to speak out what you mean by it, you shall not fail of a farther consideration from me, if I

* Answer to several late Treatises, by Dr. Stillingfleet. Lond. 1673. The general Preface.

† T. G.'s First Answer to Dr. Stillingfleet, Pref. p. 9, 10.

‡ Dr. Stillingfleet, Ibid.

§ See Dr. Stillingfleet's Conferences against T. G. p. 22, &c.

|| T. G.'s Dialogues against Dr. Stillingfleet, p. 17.

be not prevented by your receiving it from a more proper hand.

17. And thus have we done with what concerns the general cause in this Introduction ; and the sum of all is this : that of four paragraphs, of which it consists, the first is calumny ; the second, false (and I am reasonably persuaded known by you to be so) ; the third, impertinent, and long since answered (as was also the foregoing) by the Rev. Dr. Stillingfleet ; the last, seditious. I go on to the following part of this first Article, to examine what relates to myself in it.

18. Where first you except against my quoting your particular authors to find out your Church's meaning, and call it calumny, though what calumny it is to say that those authors, whom you cannot deny but that I truly cite, have expounded your Church's sense otherwise than you and some others do, I cannot imagine. But, however, you tell us :

Ad p. 3, 4.] *Reply.* "That you have nothing to do with the doctrine of the schools ; that I must take your doctrine from your Councils, the public, authentic, and universally received definitions and decisions of the Church."

Ans.] And in this you still follow your old guide, T. G.* But I have already shewn you the weakness of this pretence ;† and for your next supposal, that even those authors do not say what I affirm they do, if your proofs are as convincing as your assertion is confident, I have already promised you all you can desire, "that I will not fail to confess that you deserve not so ill a character as I thought."‡

Ad p. 4.] *Reply.* "Your next paragraph charges me with *insincerity* in stating the question betwixt Catholics (as you call them) and Protestants, for that I represented you as allowing us to hold the ancient and undoubted foundation of the Christian faith."

Ans.] And is it not the ancient and undoubted foundation of the Christian faith which we hold, and which has been delivered down to us in those very Creeds which yourselves profess, and into the faith of which you still baptize your children ? Nay, do not you yourself confess this to be true in the very place where you cavil against me for this assertion !§ Vindic. p. 24, where you grant, that what we hold is the

* T. G. Dial. against Dr. Stillingfleet, p. 56, 57.

† First Part Preface.

‡ Repl. p. 4.

§ Vindic. Art. 1. p. 24.

ancient and undoubted foundation, and only deny that it is entirely so? And again, in this very Reply, in which you repeat your accusation; p. 4.* “I told him (say you) that we do not allow the proposition, *especially if he mean* all fundamentals.” So that then the insincerity lies not in my saying that what we hold is fundamental; for this you tell me (Vindicat. p. 24) *nobody ever denied*, but for pretending that you allowed that we held *all* which you esteemed to be fundamental. Now for this I must observe,

First, That you dare not say positively that I affirmed any such thing, “I told him (you say) that we do not allow that proposition, *if he mean all* fundamentals.”† So that you positively charge me with insincerity for pretending that you granted what you do not, upon supposition that *I meant* any such thing.

Secondly, That to make something of this charge, you are forced to go back from your own concession: for whereas in your Vindication‡ you had said plainly, that though you do not allow us to hold all fundamentals, yet nobody ever denied that we held some of them; here you clap in an insinuation even against this too: “I told him that we do not allow that they hold the ancient and undoubted foundation: *especially, if he meant all* fundamentals.”§ So that though you do deny it, *especially if we mean all* fundamentals, yet you do not altogether allow even that what we hold is fundamental.

But, thirdly, Where at last do you find that I ever said, that you granted that we held *all* which you esteem to be fundamental? In my Exposition,|| I tell you, in the very next words to those you cavil at, that this was the thing to be put upon the issue; “whether those articles which you had added to this ancient and undoubted foundation as superstructures to it, were not so far from being *necessary* articles of religion, as *you pretend*, that they indeed overthrow that faith which is on both sides allowed to be divine.” And when in your Vindication you first made this little exception; I again repeated it in these very words, which you take no notice of in your Reply: “But the Vindicator, jealous for the authority of his Church, and to have whatsoever she proposes pass for fundamental, confesses that we do indeed hold a *part*, but not *all* those articles that are fundamental. *This* therefore must be

* Reply, Art. 1. p. 4.

† Vindic. p. 24.

§ Reply, p. 3.

† Reply; See before.

|| Expos. C. E. p. 5.

put upon the issue.”*—So that whereas you accuse me of perverting the Bishop of Meaux’s sense, it is indeed you that have (I fear wilfully) perverted mine. What I said, both of you acknowledge, *viz.* that what we hold is the ancient and undoubted truth; and you cannot deny the state of the question to be just as I have said, “Whether what you farther advance, and what we reject, be not so far from being fundamental truth, that it is indeed no truth at all, but rather contrary to, and destructive of that truth which is on both sides allowed to be divine?”

20. Ad p. 5.] *Reply.* But you go yet farther in this point against me; and accuse me in the next place “of perverting your own sense too, by saying that you confess that those articles which you hold, and we contradict, do by evident and undoubted consequence destroy those truths that are on both sides agreed to be fundamental. And you wonder with what spectacles I read this.”

Ans.] The spectacles I used are plain honesty and plain reason; if you have better, I envy you not. In stating the question between us, I said, “the thing to be put upon the issue was, whether those additions which the Church of Rome has made to the ancient and undoubted faith, were not so far from being fundamental truths, that they do, even by your own confession, overthrow those truths that are on both sides allowed to be fundamental?”† This you deny you ever said, and yet in your very next words you confess the contrary: “It is true (say you) I tell him, that were the doctrines and practices which *he alleges* the plain and confessed doctrines and practices of the Church of Rome, he would have reason to say that they contradict our principles: but I tell him also that we renounce these doctrines and practices.”‡ But this is not now the question, whether you renounce these doctrines and practices or no: did you not confess that those doctrines which I charge you with, do overthrow the truths that are on both sides allowed to be divine? This you cannot, nay, you do not deny: and this was what I asserted, and for which you most injuriously accuse me of perverting your sense. As to your denial of these things, that I have already shewn to be a groundless pretence, and shall yet

* Defence of the Exposition, p. 5.

† Expos. C. E. p. 5. Defence, p. 5.

‡ Reply, p. 5. Vindic. p. 23.

farther prove you to be as guilty of prevaricating in your evasion, as it is evident you have been in your accusing of me.

21. *Ibid.*] For the parallel you add between our charging you as guilty of idolatry upon the account of your worship, and the fanatics' clamours against us for our ceremonies, and against the justice of which you think we have little to say, it still more confirms me that the ancient poet I before mentioned was a wise man: for after so full a confutation as has been given to this parallel by two several hands,* for you to presume still to say, that we have little to reply to it; this would certainly have made any other creature in the world blush, but a man that has taken his leave of modesty.

22. *Ad p. 6.*] For your last little reflection, which you have dubbed with the title "of Protestant charity and moderation;" I shall only tell you, that to charge you with adoring men and women, crosses, images and relics, is no more a breach of charity, than it would be to charge a man with murder or theft whom I actually saw killing his neighbour, or stealing away his goods. If you are indeed guilty of doing this, it is charity to admonish those of their danger, whom you might otherwise ensnare by your confident denying of it. But the truth is, it is the justice of this reflection that so much troubles you: and you could be well enough content we should accuse you of doing this, if you could but find out any means to prevent our proving of it.

THE ANSWER TO THE SECOND ARTICLE.

That Religious Worship terminates ultimately in God alone.

1. *Ad p. 6.*] *Reply.* "In the beginning of this article you seem a little concerned that I took no more notice of what you had said in your Vindication, concerning your distinctions of religious worship: you pretend that I did not do it, because if I had, all my quotations out of your Liturgies would have signified just nothing; neither could I have made so plausible an excuse for my calumnies and falsifications: and you conjure me not to obstruct the hopes of a Christian unity by a future misapplication of these terms."

2. *Ans.*] It is perhaps none of the least instances of that perplexity, into which sin and error commonly lead those who have been involved in them, to consider what a multiplicity of

* Answer to the Amicable Accommodation—The View of the whole Controversy, &c.

obscure and barbarous terms the iniquity of these latter ages has invented to confound those things which are otherwise in themselves of the greatest clearness and evidence. Whilst men kept to that primitive rule of the Gospel, "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him *only* shalt thou serve;"* the law was simple and easy, and there was no need of any distinctions, either to excuse or to condemn the worship of any other besides him. The command was so plain, that the devil himself had nothing to say to it: as for the sophistry we are now to encounter (and by which you would have been able to have taken that offer which our Saviour refused, and yet have salved your conscience of any breach of the precept too), he was either yet to learn it, or else it appeared to him so thin and contemptible, that however he has since inspired others with it, yet he was ashamed himself to insist upon it. But, however, seeing men's words are their own, and let them express their conceptions after what manner they please, it is enough for us that we understand their meaning, I shall content myself to draw up a short summary of what you here offer, and which indeed is all that your party has to insist upon on this occasion, and we shall hereafter see, when you come to the application of these distinctions, whether there be any thing in them to excuse you of that guilt we here charge you with.

3. But before I enter upon this inquiry, I cannot but observe the change you make in the title of this article. Hitherto we have had it in these words, "religious worship is terminated only in God:"† now you add another restriction, "that religious worship terminates ultimately in God alone:"‡ by which you would seem to imply, that religious worship may terminate upon the objects to which you pay it, as saints or angels (and wherein you certainly depart from your own and the Bishop of Meaux's former principle), but that ultimately it must end in God alone. But the truth is (what you have been already told),§ all worship does properly terminate in the object to which it is given. You may honour a saint for God's sake, and it is an honour to God by accident so to do: but when all is done, still the proper honour that is given to the saint terminates in him, and does not pass to any other.

* Matth. iv. 10.

† Monsieur de Meaux's Exposition, Art. 3. Vindic. Art. 2.

‡ Reply, Art. 2.

§ Answer to Papists protesting, p. 29, &c. Sect. III.

And this you must confess, unless you will spoil all your distinctions. For whatever the honour be that you give to the saints, either it must finally terminate in them, and then your new addition is useless; or if it pass on to God, you must either dishonour God if you give him such an inferior honour as you do the saints, and which is altogether unsuitable to his infinite nature and majesty; or if you give the saints the same honour you do God, then you raise them up into a state above the condition of mere creatures, and so yet more dishonour God, by setting up competitors with him in his service. So that then your new modelling of this position will stand you in no stead: and you must after all say, either that no religious honour must be given to any other but God (as our Saviour has declared, and as we affirm), if you do truly believe that all religious honour ought to terminate in him alone; or you must confess, that religious worship may be terminated, and that ultimately, upon the creature; which indeed your practice shews you do believe, and for which we justly accuse you of idolatry.

4. But we will examine your own scheme, that so we may the better understand your pretences. And,

Ad p. 7, 8.] *Reply.* First, As to the words (you say) "That honour, and worship, and adoration, may admit of different senses, and according to them be differently applied. There is a divine worship proper to God, and there is a civil worship that is paid to men; and a *dulia*, or inferior sort of religious worship, that you give to saints, angels, and holy things. Secondly, That as to the outward actions of the body, whether bowing, kneeling, &c. there may be a difference in these too; they being not so appropriated to God, but that they may be paid to the creature also. That therefore, thirdly, both the actions and expressions are to be distinguished, according to the excellency of the object on which they are terminated. If the excellency be natural, or naturally acquired; then the honour that is paid is civil or human. If it be supernatural, then the honour is religious. And this religious honour is either a sovereign honour proper to God alone, called *latria*; or it is inferior, and of which there are several degrees, according to the several measures in which God bestows his supernatural gifts upon his servants, and is that you call *dulia*. And this inferior religious honour may be paid, not only to rational natures, but sometimes also to inanimate things."

5. *Answo.*] This I think is the sum of what you desire me to take notice of; and I will now return you a few general reflections upon it. And,

First, Though we are contented to take all these hard words in your own sense, yet I must observe, to prevent any misapplication of them to the passages of either holy Scripture, or primitive antiquity, before St. Augustine's time; that for what concerns the Hebrew phrases of the Old Testament, by which this worship is expressed, they are all of them promiscuous, and indifferently used with reference both to God and the creatures. But now with the Greek phrases in the New Testament it is otherwise. One of them, indeed, *viz.* that from whence you derive your term *dulia*, is ambiguous; but for the other two, λατρεύειν and προσκυνεῖν,* the former is never at all, the latter never but once, and that too in a parabolical sentence, applied to any other worship than that of God only; and not to any human or civil respect.

Secondly, As to the distinction you make between civil and religious honour properly so called, we readily embrace it: and we do confess, that the difference must be taken from the diversity of excellency in the objects on † which they are terminated. From which we infer, that there must be therefore the same proportion between civil and religious worship, as there is between God and men. Seeing then there can be no analogy between these two, neither can there be any between the worship that is paid to the one and the other. By consequence, that properly speaking, there can be no other honour attributed to a creature but what is civil, and which must be diversified according to the different excellencies of those to whom it is given. And this you yourself allow in your Vindication (p. 28. 29), where you declare that this honour is but an extrinsical denomination from the cause and motive, not from the nature of the act; and that you do renounce any other sort of religious worship which is so from the nature of the act, and by consequence only due to God. And here again in your Reply you found the appellation of religious honour with reference to the "Saints, either upon the motive of it, which is religious, or because it ultimately refers to God, for whose sake, and upon account of whose gifts we honour them."‡ Now taking this then to be not only your own private opinion, but the sense of your Church; and that you

* Matth. xviii. 26.

† Reply, p. 7.

‡ Ibid. p. 8.

may see, I desire to close as far as possibly I can with your notions, I add,

Thirdly, That as to the first of these, "the religious motive;" we are content in this respect to allow the denomination of religious worship to others besides God. Such is the honour we render to our parents, to civil magistrates, &c. upon the account of God's command so to do. And thus the two terms of civil and religious are not opposite, but co-ordinate, and consistent with one another. Secondly, For the other grounds on which you call this honour, *religious*, namely, upon the account of those supernatural gifts or excellencies which God has bestowed upon his creatures; we are ready to allow of this too. And thus we confess, that the honour which we, as well as you, pay to the saints, may be called religious; when we bless God for their excellencies, and pray to him for grace to follow their examples. We never denied but that godly and religious men were to be revered, not only for their other qualities, but yet more especially for their sanctity and devotion. But then,

Fourthly, As for religious honour, properly so called, and as it respects not merely the religious motive, or the supernatural gifts which God has bestowed upon his servants, but the very nature and quality of the act itself; such acts by which we pay not only all that worship which may be due to the excellencies of a pure creature, but the proper exercises of religion, as prayer, confession, and such like; and these with all the circumstances of a proper, religious worship; in the house of God, in the midst of his solemn service, it may be in the same breath and form in which we address to the Creator; this is that religious worship which we constantly affirm, and which you yourself confess may not without impiety be given to any but God only; and it is for this we charge you with that, which by your own acknowledgment none of your distinctions reach to, nor will therefore excuse you of, *viz.* idolatry.

Fifthly, As for the outward expressions of this honour by bodily actions, as bowing, kneeling, prostrating, &c. these we confess are ambiguous, and must be determined by the other circumstances. But then we deny that they are to be interpreted merely according to the intention of him that performs them. There is an external adoration, which no internal act of the understanding or will can excuse, if it be applied to any besides God. Such as is performed with those circumstances

of a religious worship before mentioned, as to time, place, words, and the like. In short, it is, we say, idolatry by any external act whatsoever, to shew that we do attribute religious honour to any other but God alone.

Sixthly, And for the rest, we do affirm, that there are some other kind of external actions so peculiarly appropriate to God, that they cannot without idolatry be attributed to any other. Such as, first, sacrifice,* by your own confession :† to which I will, secondly, add all those other things of the like kind which God appropriated to himself under the law ; as religious adoration, erection of temples and altars, burning of incense in token of divine worship, solemn invocation and vows ; in all which neither our Saviour nor his Apostles having made the least alteration, we ought certainly (as both the Jews and primitive Christians most undoubtedly did) to esteem them still as his own peculiar prerogative.

Having thus established in general our notion of religious worship ; let us see if any of these distinctions will (as you pretend) excuse you of that imputation which has been laid upon you.

ANSWER TO THE THIRD ARTICLE.

Of the Invocation of Saints.

In the beginning of this Article‡ I cannot but acknowledge a commendable endeavour in you to clear the true state of the question betwixt us : and though I am not absolutely of your mind, nor do I see any cause for your supposal that Mr. Thorndyke§ spoke the sense of the Church of England in every one of those particulars mentioned by you in order thereunto, yet I will not enter into any controversy with you about them.

1. And first, Be it allowed that the words prayer, invocation, calling upon, address, &c. are or may be equivocal ; *i. e.* (as that learned man phrases it) that we may make use of the same expressions in signifying our requests to God and to man ; though yet for the first two of these, *viz.* prayer and invocation, they are seldom applied to any other than a religious sense.

* Bishop of Meaux's Exposition, sect. iii. p. 4.

† See this prosecuted at large in Dr. Stillingfleet's first Answer to T. G. p. 190 to 283.

‡ Reply, p. 10.

§ Page 11.

This T. G. long since observed, and you have now borrowed it from him ; and you may make what use of this remark you please in managing of this controversy.

2. We do not deny but that we ought to honour the saints departed, as well as holy men upon earth ; only we desire that that honour be such as becomes them to receive, and us to pay. We honour them when we praise, and much more when we follow their faith and patience. And because the reason and end of this honour is religious, you may without being contradicted by me call the honour itself religious too ; seeing you explain yourself to mean no more by it, than an external denomination from the cause and motive, but not from the nature of the act itself.*

3. Nor will I dispute with you, lastly, whether the saints in happiness do not in general pray for the Church militant ; for it is to as little purpose to deny what cannot be disproved, as to affirm what one cannot prove. I have as great an honour as any man for Mr. Thorndyke's memory, but yet I cannot see the proof even of this in those Scriptures which, as you say, he proves it by. Some Fathers, I know, have said so ; † but their saying is not to me a sufficient proof of a point of doctrine. When all is done, the congruity of the thing is the best that can be brought for it ; and if, upon this account, you are resolved to call them advocates, or intercessors between God and us, ‡ you will, I hope, excuse me if I do not comply with you in it. That they are full of charity towards us who are members of the same body with them, I make not the least question ; but how they express it I do not certainly know, because many particulars there are, from whence such a matter is to be concluded, which are all hidden from my knowledge. One thing I know, that we have a Mediator at the right hand of God, who knows all our wants, which I see no reason to believe the greatest saint in heaven does. I am likewise assured, that his right to intercede for us is founded upon the sacrifice of his death. And since the Gospel gives this honour and prerogative to him *only*, to appear in the presence of God for us, I shall never, whilst I live, help forward an ambiguity in those titles, of a mediator with God, or an advocate with the Father, or an intercessor in heaven, by attributing of them to any saint whatever. These expressions, so applied, are dangerous and scandalous ; and it is but a

* Vindic. p. 28, 29,

† Reply, p. 11.

‡ Ibid.

frivolous pretence for the doing of it, that possibly the saints may do something for us in heaven, upon the account of which the titles of our Redeemer may, in some sense, be given to them.

2. As for the state of the question which you next propose,* you should know by this time, that we are by no means agreed that the only thing in dispute betwixt us is, whether it be lawful for us to pray to the saints that they would pray for us? and whether such kind of addresses as these, are of such a nature as to make gods (for so you tell me I very disrespectfully call them, though I believe you will find it is your Misrepresenter's phrase, and not mine) of men and women?† You do indeed, with your guides, T. G. and the Bishop of Meaux, tell us, that all the prayers of your Church, be their words never so repugnant, must yet be reduced to this sense, *pray for us*. But you have often been told, that this is utterly disallowed by us. However, to take off all occasion of cavil, as far as is possible, I will offer you the state of the question in such terms, as you shall have no just cause to except against it, *viz.* :

“Whether it be lawful to pray to the saints, after the manner that is at this day prescribed and practised in the Church of Rome?”

And I will so far comply with you as to consider it in both respects : 1. According to your own representation of it ; 2. According to that which is indeed your practice, and freely acknowledged by the greatest men of your Church to be so.

POINT I.

Whether it be lawful to pray to the Saints to pray for us ?

3. This is the least that can possibly be made of this matter; and because I would bring the point to the fairest issue that may be, as I have proposed the question according to your own desire, so I will dispute it with you upon your own principles.

4. And, first ; for what concerns the terms of the question, they are exactly taken from your own words. You tell us, in your Vindication,‡ that all you say is, “that it is *lawful* to pray to the saints ;” and here, in your Reply,§ that the dif-

* Reply, p. 11.

† Vindic. p. 30.

‡ Ibid.

§ Reply, p. 11.

ference between us is, "whether it be *lawful* for us to pray to them?" In which yet you seem to fall a little below even the Bishop of Meaux himself, who tells us, "that your Church teaches that it is *profitable* at least to pray to them."* But, however, such is our security, according to both of you, that neither you nor he care to say it is our duty so to do, or that we run any danger in the neglect of it. Whatever, therefore, be the issue of this dispute, it is wholly your concern to look to it: thus much we are agreed in, that there is no sin in our omission; for where there is no law, there is no transgression.

5. But I will now presume to go farther. And since you dare not say that such an invocation is necessary, I will undertake to affirm, that neither is it profitable, nor indeed lawful, but utterly forbidden; and, for proof of this, I shall lay down no other foundation than what you have yourself established, *viz.* that religious honour or worship may be taken in a double sense; "first, strictly, and so is due only to God; secondly, more largely, and so may be paid to creatures."† And what you mean by these terms, you thus more fully express: "that by religious honour, in this latter sense, and as you apply it to the saints, you understand only an honour so called, by an extrinsical denomination, from the *cause* and *motive*, but not from the *nature* of the *act* itself;"‡ that is, such an honour as may be in itself civil, and is only *called* religious, because it is done for God's sake, and in obedience to God's commands. But for a strict and proper religious worship, such as is in its own nature so, this you confess, with us, to be due to God *only*: from whence I conclude, that to give such a worship to any creature, must be to pay that service to the creature which is due only to the Creator; and that is, in our sense, to commit idolatry.

6. And now, from this principle which you have yourself laid down, and which you think "will be alone sufficient to answer all objections brought against your doctrine,"§ I take leave to infer, "that if even such an invocation, as you confess you pay to the saints, be strictly a religious honour, in the very nature of the act itself, and not barely by an extrinsical denomination from the cause and motive of it, it will then remain that you are guilty, in this service, of giving that worship to the saints which is due only to God, and are, by

* Exposit. sect. iv. p. 5.

† Ibid. p. 28, 29.

‡ See Vindic. p. 27.

§ Vindic. p. 28.

consequence, therein guilty of idolatry." And this I shall shew,

I. From the very nature of the act itself.

II. From the circumstances of it.

I. That the very nature of the act itself, of invoking the saints, does shew, that it is strictly and properly a religious worship.

7. This is what I know Monsieur de Meaux denies. He tells us, "that when you pray to the saints, you do it in the same spirit of charity, and according to the same order of brotherly society, which moves us to demand assistance of our brethren living upon earth."* Thus he smooths your invocation of saints departed, to make it lie even with our desires of one another's prayers; but did he, in good earnest, believe, that nothing but a spirit of charity, and the order of brotherly society, is to be discerned in the act of calling upon departed saints to pray for us? We have indeed that charity for them, as to believe that they have charity for us; and though they are highly advanced above us, we yet take them to be our brethren; but is this all that is implied in the act of calling upon them to pray for us? For my part, I cannot but believe that Monsieur de Meaux himself was sensible of a vast difference in the case, as appears by his endeavouring to blind it afterwards; and I shall now offer some reasons, that may perhaps convince others, as I have fully satisfied myself, about it.

8. For, 1. If the nature of that act of invoking the saints in heaven, be the same with that of desiring my Christian brother to pray for me upon earth, then, on the other hand, this is also of the same nature with that; and, by consequence, I may as well fall down upon my knees here in London, and desire my Christian brother, who is now, it may be, in Japan, or somewhere in the East Indies, or perhaps on his return homewards, to pray for me, as do the like to St. Peter or St. Paul, who, for anything I can tell, are at a vastly greater distance from me than my friend upon earth is. But if there be something more than a spirit of charity, or an acknowledgment of brotherhood, in calling upon my living friend, who is out of all natural distance of hearing, there is also something more than this in calling upon the dead, who, it may be, are a thousand times farther from me than the living can be from

* Expos. Art. 4.

one another. Would not such an invocation of my friend, think you, suppose him to be more than a brother or a man? Would not the nature of the act ascribe to him, not only the praise of charity, but likewise the power of hearing and knowing all that is said upon earth, at any distance whatsoever? I grant, that if this were indeed no more than according to the order of fraternal society, neither would it be any more than so for you to call upon the saints deceased to pray for you; but if the former would be more, when you have said all that you can, the latter must necessarily be so too, and you do thereby elevate the saints above the condition of creatures; for, whether you believe them to be omnipresent or not, the very act of invoking them indifferently in any place, and their being called upon in several places at the same time, does imply their omnipresence, unless you could give us some other ground of certainty, that they hear you, besides this, that wherever they are when they are spoken to, and wherever you are when you speak to them, it is all one,—they do as surely know what you say, as if they stood within the common distance of hearing. Now, that action, which, in the very nature of it, ascribes an immensity of presence to the object about which it is conversant, is religious in the very nature of the act; and, then, I leave it to you to determine, whether it be idolatrous or not, if it be paid to anything that is not God. But,

9. Secondly, If you are not yet satisfied, I would desire to know, whether prayer to God, which you will not deny to be in its own nature a religious act, be not so, upon this account, as well as others, that it is an acknowledgment of his immense presence? But how is it such an acknowledgment, otherwise than as we do, in all places and at all times, call upon him? Since, therefore, you do, in all places and at all times, call upon the saints as well as upon God, I pray tell us, why this invocation should not also be, in its own nature, religious worship? If you allow this, then you have already passed sentence upon yourself; if you do not, I should be glad you would find a little leisure to shew us the difference. This is an argument that has been often enough urged to be taken notice of; and if you shall still go on to say nothing to it, we shall conclude the reason to be, that indeed you have nothing to object against it.

10. And what I have now said of this invocation, upon the account of the distance of the saints from us, that they are

now out of the compass of all civil commerce ; and therefore to pray to them must be properly a religious worship, will be yet further confirmed, thirdly, by another of your practices ; in that your Church allows not only vocal, but even mental prayer to be made to them. Now this can be no act of civil honour, seeing no creature, such as man (the object of all civil honour) is, can be capable of searching the heart, so as to find out the secrets of it. For "God, even God only, knows the secrets of all the children of men."* And therefore to pray in our minds to the saints, to offer up the secret aspirations of our souls, in honour to any creature, this must be an act of religious worship, and such therefore as by your own acknowledgment is due to God only.

11. Now that you could not be ignorant of these things, and by consequence are the more inexcusable in this your worship, appears from what Monsieur de Meaux has told us ; viz. "That by addressing prayers to the saints,† and honouring them all the world over as present, you do not attribute to them a certain kind of immensity, nor the knowledge of the secrets of the heart, which God has reserved to himself ; seeing it is manifest, that to say a creature may have the knowledge of these things by a light communicated to him by God, is not to elevate a creature above his condition." Thus he gives that to the saints in the close, which he denied in the beginning. They have not a kind of immensity, nor do they know the secrets of our hearts ; no, by no means, for that is necessary to be said to save yourselves from giving divine honour to the saints : but for all that they have the knowledge of these things by a light communicated to them by God ; and this is also necessary to be said, to save your invocation of them from being a foolish and absurd devotion. And for the same reason he supposed before, that "some grounds, which he would not examine, might be had to attribute to the saints some certain degree of knowledge as to those things that are acted amongst us, as also of our secret thoughts." Thus he doubles, and treads with fear, like a man that has lost his way in a dark night, and is afraid of a ditch every step he takes. To say that the saints know all our wants and desires, and the secrets of our hearts, is to give them a certain kind of immensity which he dares not say they have ; and therefore those words are slipped in, that "some grounds may be had to attribute to

* 1 Kings viii. 31.

† Expos. Sect. 4.

them some certain degree of knowledge as to these things." Now a certain degree of knowledge seems to me to be a certain kind of immensity; and so you are for a while safe on that side. Well, but a certain degree of knowledge, as to these things, will not serve to make all the prayers of all men, at any time, and in any place, to this or that saint, wise and profitable prayers. For a certain degree is but a degree; and to answer all that is, or that you would have to be done in this kind, nothing will serve but a certain kind of immensity. And therefore, on the other hand, a creature may have the knowledge of these things, *i.e.* of *all* these things. So that now the prayers are profitable again; but then what shall we do to keep off immensity from being attributed to the creature? He has a trick for that, and it is this; *viz.* that this kind of immensity or knowledge of all prayers that are or can be any where offered to them, is communicated to them by God, and as long as God has made them thus immense, we may do so too.

12. And thus he represents the saints as *Dii facti*, made gods, and that by the Almighty himself; which being done with respect to omnipresence, may, whenever a wretched cause requires it, be done as well with respect to omnipotence, and all the other divine perfections; and in one word leads to such consequences, as cannot but stir up the indignation of all good men. Nothing should be maintained in the minds of Christian people with more care than the distinct notion they ought to have of God and his creatures. But your doctrine and practice in this kind does so confound these apprehensions of the one and the other, that they cannot tell what prerogative, as to the matter of hearing prayers, God has above his saints; since they hear all, as well as he. Prayer to God every where is that which principally supports in the minds of men the apprehension of his being every where present: and though much of it is due to the natural impressions which God has left of himself in our souls, yet the reflections we make upon it, are chiefly owing to the frequent addresses we make every where, publicly and privately, to the invisible Being, the Lord of all, of whom we have some knowledge by nature, and more by Christian instruction. But when prayer is made to other invisible beings as generally as to God, how can it be otherwise, but that the people should conceive them to be as omnipresent as God himself is? especially if it be considered, that when their educated and philosophical men, come to vindicate

their practice and doctrine from this imputation, they cannot so much as speak sense about it, but with all their art, talk more meanly and confusedly than mere nature would instruct an honest man to do. The difference between the people and the blind guides on the one side, and between the seers on the other, being only this, that the worship and the notions of the former go together, and are of a piece; but the latter, with as bad a worship, have better notions; and give that honour to the saints by their practice, which their notions (as they would have us think at least) deny to them. But for that reason they are the more to blame: and though their idolatry be not so gross as the people's, yet it is more inexcusable.

13. And yet if we may judge of their thoughts by their words, some of the refined controvertists do not come much behind the common people in this stupidity. If they think otherwise than they say, they are to answer to God for that too.* Cardinal Bellarmine, and others, who had none of these expounding designs to carry on, speak out freely, and tell us, that the saints are *Dii per participationem*, gods by participation; and upon that account he justifies the practice of the Church of Rome,† in swearing by them, and making vows to them. Nor indeed do I see how that differs very much from Monsieur de Meaux's giving them the knowledge which the hearing of all prayers requires, as by a light communicated to them by God. For what is that but to say, that God has (in effect) made them partakers of his immensity? nay, the Representer (if we may conclude any thing from his arguing) seems plainly to yield, that the saints have a natural knowledge of our prayers:‡ “For (says he) Abraham heard the petition of Dives, who was yet at a greater distance from him (than the saints are from us), even in hell: and told him likewise the manner of his living whilst as yet on earth. Nay, since it is generally allowed, that the very devils hear those desperate wretches who call on them, why should we doubt that the saints want this privilege?”

14. No wonder, therefore, if Bellarmine makes a greater difference between the prayers to the saints, and our desires of good men's prayers upon earth, than Monsieur de Meaux seems willing to acknowledge; and looks upon it to be a worship due to them, thus (in the words of your Synod of Trent)§

* De Cultu ss. lib. 3. c. 9.

† Expos. §. 4. p. 7.

‡ Part 1. §. 2. p. 3.

§ Conc. Trid. Sess. ult. [Labbe, Concil. vol. 14. p. 895. Lut. Par. 1672.]

suppliantly to call upon them: for what can be more reasonable than to esteem that prayer, the invocation of suppliants, and the worship of invocation, which is made with such deference of respect from the very nature of the act, as is due to God, the only Omnipresent Being? and what more unreasonable and foolish, than to call our desires of each others' prayers by such titles as these?

And hitherto have I shewn, that in the very act of praying to the saints, without any regard had to the form or substance of your petitions, or the circumstances with which you call upon them, you give proper, religious worship to them, which you acknowledge it is unlawful for you to do. I proceed, secondly, to shew this yet more plainly,

II. From the circumstances of it.

15. And here to avoid, if it be possible, all your little cavils so usual upon this occasion; as in speaking to the former part of this argument, I have managed it so as not to concern myself with any of your distinctions* of supreme and inferior religious worship; so here I will not insist on those exterior actions of the body, which you tell me are equivocal, and of which Monsieur de Meaux roundly affirms, "that the nature of that exterior honour which you render to the saints, must be judged from the internal sentiments of the mind."† The circumstances I shall now insist upon are such, as are not liable to any of these evasions; but will, if not silence a contentious spirit, yet I am confident, satisfy any unprejudiced Christian, that the prayers which you make to the saints are properly a religious act, and not only called so by an external denomination from the cause and motive of them.

16. For, 1. What else can be gathered from 'those outward circumstances, of the place, time, and manner (to say nothing of the gestures of the body) with which you call upon them? Do not all these speak plainly to us what the nature of this worship is? You pray (for instance) to the saints in the house of God, it may be in a temple which you have consecrated at once to the service of God, and to the honour of the saint whom you invoke. You accompany these prayers with incense smoking before their images; a circumstance which was once reckoned as a peculiar instance of external religious adoration; and which was therefore thought so appropriate an act of divine worship among the primitive Christians, that they chose to die rather than to throw a little incense into

* Reply, p. 7.

† Expos. p. 8.

the fire upon the heathen altars. You call at the same instant upon the one and upon the other, and too often place them in an equal rank with one another. "Thus,* if you confess your sins, you do it to God Almighty, to the blessed Virgin, to St. Michael the Archangel, to St. John Baptist, to the holy Apostles St. Peter and St. Paul, and in short, to all saints: if you commend a departing soul, you bid him go out in the name of God the Father Almighty, who created him;† and of Jesus Christ, Son of the living God, who suffered for him; and in the name of the Holy Ghost, who was poured out upon him; in the name of angels and archangels, apostles, evangelists, &c. If you conjure a tempest, you call upon God‡ and the holy angels, you adjure the evil spirit, you contradict him, by the virtue of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the blessed Virgin Mary. In the offices of the Church, your addresses to God, and the blessed Virgin, are so interwoven with each other, that there is no alteration but only in the manner of the expression, and very often not in that neither: as when you pray (for instance)§ that the Virgin Mary and her Son would bless you. In the doxologies of your greatest men at the end of their works, nothing more frequent than that of Jesu-Maria. Even your solemn excommunications and absolutions are made in the name and authority of the holy Trinity, the blessed Virgin, and all the saints; and the passion of Christ joined in equal rank with the merits of the Virgin Mary for the remission of their sins. By all which it undoubtedly appears, that either your invocation of God himself is not properly a religious act, or if that be strictly a religious worship, the other will be so also."

17. Secondly, Another circumstance which plainly shews your invocation of saints to be in the very nature of the act a religious service, is that you offer not only your prayers, but your very sacrifice too, to their honour and veneration: and this I am sure you will not deny to be truly a religious act. Thus in the Missal of Salisbury:

"Accept, O holy Trinity, this oblation,¶ which I, unworthy

* Missal. R. in Ord. Miss. [p. 212. Par. 1739.]

† Rituale R. Ord. Comm. An. [p. 136. Mechlin. 1845.]

‡ Ritual. Fr. de Sales, p. 77. in fin. [Lyon. 1632.]

§ Offic. B. V. p. 84. [Antv. 1631.]

¶ Pontific. R. Ord. Excom. et Absolv. p. 196, 197. [Venet. 1561.] [vol. 3. p. 170, 174, 177. Rom. 1740.]

¶ In Ord. Missæ. [1527.] fol. 146.

sinner, offer in honour of thee, and of the blessed Virgin Mary, and of all saints."

And in the common Roman Missal :

"Accept, O holy Trinity, this oblation, which we offer to thee in memory of the passion, resurrection, and ascension of our Lord Jesus Christ, and in honour of the ever-blessed Virgin Mary, and of the blessed John the Baptist ; and of the holy apostles Peter and Paul."*

And in the Post-Communion of the Mass of the blessed Virgin :

"Having received, O Lord, the defence of our salvation, grant, we beseech thee, that we may every where be defended by the patronage of the blessed Virgin, for whose veneration we have offered this to thy Majesty."†

Now, not to enter on an inquiry, how far these expressions will in some measure apply the very sacrifice itself to those saints ; it being hardly intelligible otherwise what honour can be done to the saints, by a sacrifice offered solely to God ; it cannot be doubted, but that this being confessedly a proper, religious act, whatever honour is hereby done the saints, must be strictly and properly a religious honour ; not merely in denomination, but in the very nature of the thing itself. And I desire Monsieur de Meaux to tell us, whether this too be done with the same spirit of charity, and in the same order of brotherly society with which we entreat our brethren upon earth to pray for us. And what would be thought of him, that out of kindness, or respect to his fellow Christian, should offer up the Son of God for his honour, or (as the last prayer has it) in his veneration.

I do not pretend that this is properly an act of prayer to saints ; and therefore I propose it only as a circumstance from whence to conclude what the true nature of your invocation of them is. For if it appear, that the other parts of that worship you pay to the saints, are properly religious acts, it will not be doubted but that your praying to them is certainly so too. And though you have restrained the terms of our question to this one particular instance, of calling upon them, yet it suffices me in general to conclude against you, that you do give proper religious honour to others besides God, if it appear that any part of that worship you pay to the saints is such.

* Ord. Miss. p. 311. Paris. 1616.

† Rituale Fr. de Saler. par. post. p. 19. Lyon. 1632.

18. Nor is it by any means to be forgot here, that in almost every one of these masses you desire to be accepted by the *merits* of that saint in whose honour or veneration the mass itself is offered. I will give you an instance or two of this :

“Regard, we most humbly beseech thee, O Lord, these things which we offer to thee : and by the *merits* of thy blessed Bishop Julian, deliver us from all sin.”*

“Let the *merits* of St. Bathildis obtain, that these gifts may be accepted by thee.”

“We load thy table, O Lord, with mystical gifts in commemoration of St. Agatha, thy virgin and martyr ; humbly beseeching thy Majesty, that by the help of *her merits*, we may be freed from all contagions.”†

Thus (as I have heretofore observed) do you join the *merits* of Christ, whom you suppose to be the offering, with the *merits* of your saints ; and make a Bathildis or a Julian joint intercessors with the Son of God for your forgiveness. What is this but truly to ascribe to the creature the honour of the Creator, and to worship them with a religious worship, in the utmost propriety of the expression ?

19. I shall add but one circumstance more, and that of another sort of service with which you sometimes accompany your prayers to the saints, and which I think will undeniably convince you, that you do give them the most strict acts of religious service ; and that is, your making of vows to them. That this is a proper act of religion,‡ both the holy Scripture evidently shews, and the reason of the thing itself declares ; a vow being in its own nature nothing else than a promise made to God ; and such by which he is acknowledged to be the Searcher of the heart, and the just Avenger of all perfidious promisers, as he is the bountiful Rewarder of those who are faithful in his service. And your own authors § unanimously acknowledge it to be an act, not only of proper, but of supreme religious worship.

20. And yet even this too is paid by you to the saints : and I desire you to consider what you then did, when at the entry into your order (if you herein, as I suppose, agree with the manner of your brethren the Dominicans ||), you solemnly

* Missale in usum Sarum. Fest. Januarii [ut supra,] fol. 10.

† Ibid. fol. 13.

‡ Numb. xxx. Deuter. xxiii.

§ Aquinas 2da. 2æ. Qu. 88. A. 5. [vol. 22. p. 371. col. 1. Venet. 1787.]

|| Vid. Annot. Cajet. in D. Th. Qu. 88. Ar. 5. p. 313. Lugd. 1562.

vowed to "God, to the blessed Virgin, to St. Benedict, and to all the saints, that you would be obedient to your superiors." Now this I the rather remark, because the answer that is made by your writers to justify this practice, plainly condemns you (not only in this point, but in that of your prayers too) upon your own principle, as idolaters. They acknowledge the act to be *properly religious*; that these vows are made after the very *same manner* to God and the saints. And Cardinal Cajetan,* anticipating this objection, "that to vow is an act of supreme religious worship; and how then may it be given to the saints?" answers, "That it is an act of the same kind to *vow* and to *pray*; but (says he) we pray to the saints in order to God, and therefore in the same manner we vow to them too." And the main excuse which he makes for both, is the utter ruin of yours and Monsieur de Meaux's pretences, *viz.* that the saints are *gods by participation*. A remark which Cardinal Bellarmine † thought so considerable, that he from thence distinguishes between the promises that are made to men on earth, and to the saints in heaven; so that the former are only promises, the latter are vows: "because a vow does not agree otherwise to the saints, than as they are *gods by participation*."

21. The consequence of all is this plain conclusion, that if a vow be strictly and properly an act of religious worship, and not only called so by an extrinsical denomination from the cause and motive of it; and prayer (as Cardinal Cajetan says) be an act of the same kind with it; then are they both acts, by your own acknowledgment, due only to God: and therefore it must be a sin to give them to any other; and being a sin in a matter of religious worship, whereby that honour is given to the creature, which is due only to God, it remains, according to our notion, that it must be idolatry.

22. And thus have I hitherto argued against that worship you pay to the saints, upon your own principle, and according to your own proposal: I shall only add, to close this first point, that whether these arguments shall be thought of force sufficient to convict you of what I am persuaded you are guilty in this service, it is your concern alone to weigh. If they are, I need not say anything to exaggerate your offence which you commit in this matter: if they are not, yet whilst we are neither defective in our veneration towards those blessed souls,

* Ibid. † Bellarm. de Cult. SS. l. 3. c. 9. p. 2235. D. [Ingolst. 1586.]

but pay them all that honour (as I have before shewn) of which they are now capable ; whilst we transgress no command of God in our omission of these superstitions ; nor fail continually to address ourselves to the throne of grace, through our great and only Mediator Jesus Christ ; we are not only sure of his intercession, who we know is able both to hear and help us ; but also in a most likely way of obtaining the charitable assistances of those holy souls too, who, if they have any knowledge of us, or concern for what passes here below, will doubtless need no solicitation to be kind to us ; but without our entreaty offer up their prayers to God, for all those who thus serve him in sincerity and truth.

23. But I must now go much farther, and bring my charge more closely against you, by shewing, secondly :

POINT II.

What the true Doctrine and Practice of the Church of Rome is, as to the point of Invocation of Saints.

Now the sum of this point may, I think, best be reduced to these four considerations, by which you endeavour in your Reply to justify yourselves in this particular.

For, I. As to the prayers themselves, you cannot deny but that in the natural sense of them, they do imply a proper and formal invocation of the saints to whom you address : but then you tell us, that the Church's sense is much otherwise ; and therefore that whatever their words may seem to imply, yet the intention of them all is one and the same, *viz. pray for us.*

II. That as to what we object concerning the *merits* of the saints, your concluding of all your prayers in this form : "through Jesus Christ our Lord," plainly shews that you mean no more by it than this, "that God would vouchsafe to call to mind the glorious actions and sufferings of his saints, performed in and by his grace, and upon those accounts accept your sacrifices, or hear your prayers."*

III. That for those addresses you have the warrant both of Scripture and antiquity : whereas,

IV. We have neither against them ; those pretensions, I offered in my Defence being either false or deceitful, or at least not conclusive enough to engage you to lay aside a

* Reply, Art. iii. §. 18. p. 23.

practice which has been so many hundred years in the Church, and that by our own confession.

This is the sum of what is said on this occasion, not only by yourself, but by the generality of your party ; and to this I shall answer with all the plainness and candour that I am able.

SECT. I.

Whether all the Prayers that are made to the Saints by those of the Church of Rome are fairly to be reduced to this one sense, " Pray for us ?"

24. For thus it is that you expound yourselves.

" That in what terms soever those prayers which you address to the saints are couched, the intention of your Church reduces them always to this form: "*Pray for us.*" You charge me with *voluntarily* fixing the words of your addresses, which are equivocal, to an univocal sense ; and that had I, either as became a Christian or a scholar, taken notice of this direction laid down by the Bishop of Condom, both in his book, and in his advertisement, I should have saved myself the labour of amassing such an appendix as I have made to this article, and the reader the trouble of perusing it to as little purpose. Since though your Church does indeed make her addresses to the saints for protection and power against your enemies, for help and assistance, and the like, yet it does appear manifestly to any one who is not *wilful* in his *mistakes*, that all these are reduced to an *ora pro nobis*, it being a kind of aid, succour, and protection, to recommend the miserable to him who alone can succour them."*

25. *Ans.* Such, then, are your pretences. To your reflections I have spoken already ; I come now to examine your reasons : and to convince others, if not you, that I was not *wilful* in my *mistakes* as to the meaning of your prayers, but that you are a sort of miserable shufflers in your pretended expositions of them. For tell me now, I beseech you, by what authority is it that your new guides, T. G.† and the Bishop of Meaux undertake thus to detort the plain expressions of your addresses to a signification utterly repugnant to the natural meaning of them ? Have any of your general approved Councils‡

* Reply. Art. iii. sect. 16. p. 22.

† Answer to Dr. Stillingfleet, p. 399, 406, 407. ‡ Full Answer, p. 6.
VOL. XII . D

positively defined this to be all your design in them? And if they have not, are not you, according to your own language,* in your accusing of me on this occasion, a falsifier, a calumniator, and a misrepresenter *too*? Does the Council of Trent, where it decrees this service is to be paid to them, say that this shall be the universal, ecclesiastical sense of these devotions? Nay, does but so much as one single rubric in all your offices give us the least intimation of it?

26. It is, I know, pretended by Monsieur de Meaux,† that your Catechism authorizes this exposition of them; where it “teaches the difference there is between your praying to God, and to the saints. For that you pray to God, either that he would give you good things, or that he would deliver you from evil; but to the saints, that they would undertake your patronage, and obtain for you those things you stand in need of. That from hence arise two different forms of prayer: for that to God you say properly *have mercy upon us*, or *hear our prayers*; but to the saints, *pray for us*.”

27. Such are that Bishop's pretences, and it must be confessed they have something that is plausible in them: though what will soon vanish when it comes to be examined to the bottom. For be it allowed, as he desires, that there are here proposed two different forms of prayer; for indeed we do not deny but that in general you may pray with other sentiments to God, than to the saints; though too often in your prayers themselves we find no great care taken to distinguish them: to God, as to the first and supreme Dispenser of all good; to the saints, only as his ministers and inferior distributors of it. “But does this therefore reduce all the prayers you make to the saints, in whatever terms they are conceived, to this one form, *pray for us*?” Judge, I beseech you, by those words which immediately follow in the Catechism,‡ but were not for the turn of an expounder, and therefore his Lordship thought good to omit them: “Although it be lawful, in *another manner*, to ask of the saints themselves that *they would have mercy upon us*, for they are very merciful.”

28. If this be *another manner* from the foregoing, then I am sure all the prayers of your Church are not to be reduced to that one form, *pray for us*. But what is this other man-

* Ibid. p. 7.

† Catechism. Conc. Trid. Part. 4. p. 345. [p. 487. Mechlin. 1831.]

Tit. Quis orandus sit?

‡ Catechism. Ibid. [p. 488.]

ner? "We may pray* (says the Catechism) that being moved at the misery of our condition, they would help us with their *favour* and *deprecation* with God." So that here then is somewhat more, at least in the opinion of your own Catechism, than a mere praying for us: here is encouragement to ask not only their prayers, but also their favour and interest too. But indeed the Catechism goes yet farther: for giving a reason why angels are to be invoked, "They are† (says the Catechism) to be prayed to, because they both continually look upon God, and most willingly undertake the patronage of our salvation, which *is committed* to them:" and from thence in the next section it infers the like necessity of honouring the saints.

29. This is plain dealing, and gives us an authentic exposition of that passage in the Council of Trent, whose sense you no less pervert than that of your Liturgies; *viz.* "That for obtaining the benefits of God by his Son Jesus Christ,‡ you should betake yourselves to their (the saints) prayers, aid, and assistance: and to this end, that you should not barely invoke them, but invoke them in a suppliant manner, as those who reign now with Christ." A circumstance this which was not put in by chance, but was thought so considerable as to be mentioned in Pope Pius's Profession of Faith, where nothing superfluous was to be admitted; and where you declare, "that you firmly believe that the saints who *reign* together with Christ, are to be venerated and invoked." Insomuch that (as I have before observed) your great Cardinals, Cajetan and Bellarmine, doubt not to call them "gods by participation;" and to deliver it as the Catholic doctrine (and we know how conformable the Catholic practice is to it amongst you), "that the saints are set over us, and take care of us, and that the faithful here on earth are *ruled* and *governed* by them."§ By all which it appears with what sincerity you pretend, that all your Church teaches is only to pray to the saints, "in the same spirit of charity,|| and according to the same order of fraternal society, with which you demand the assistance of your brethren living upon earth." And how false it is, that you are taught to reduce all the forms of your addresses to this one meaning, *pray for us*;

* Ibid. † Pars 3. de Cultu et Invocatione SS. n. 19, 20. p. 255.

[p. 306. Par. 1831.]

‡ Concil. Trid. Sess. 25. de Invocat. &c. p. 292. [Colon. 1619.]

[Labbe, Concil. ut supra, vol. 14. p. 895.]

§ Bellarm. de SS. Beat. L. 1. c. 18, 20. [vol. 2. p. 410. col. 2. 418. col. 2. Prag. 1721.]

|| Bishop of Meaux's Expos. Sect. 4.

seeing you both direct the faithful "to recur to them for their prayers, aid, and assistance;" and suppose them capable, as reigning together with Christ, and gods by participation, but especially as having the care of the faithful committed to them, to rule and govern them, to lend you other help and assistance besides that of their prayers, and (as I shall presently shew) pray to them accordingly so to do.

30. But, secondly, We will examine this point a little further: and indeed the whole mystery of this service in the Church of Rome depends upon a right understanding of what notion they have of the saints above. And because I will do this without any suspicion of falsity, I will deliver nothing but from Cardinal Bellarmine's own words. In his book of the *Eternal Felicity of the Saints*, among other reasons that he gives, "why the place and the state of the blessed should be called the kingdom of heaven,"* he has this for one, "Because all the blessed in heaven are kings, and all the qualities of kings do most properly agree to them. The just (says he) in the kingdom of their Father, shall be themselves kings of the kingdom of heaven; for they shall be partakers of his kingly dignity, and of the power, and riches, and other goods that are in the kingdom of heaven." Which is, I suppose, a plain paraphrase of what he elsewhere says, "that they are gods by participation,† or partakers of the dignity and power of God."

31. Having thus established his foundation, he now goes on to the practical demonstration of it. "That goods‡ (says he) of an earthly kingdom are usually reckoned to be these four, power, honour, riches, and pleasure. An earthly king has power to command his subjects; if they do not obey him, he can punish them with bonds, imprisonment, exile, scourging, death. Again; kings will be honoured with an honour almost above the nature of men; for they will be adored upon the knee; nor will they vouchsafe oftentimes to hear those that speak to them, unless in this bended posture, and with their face down to the ground." But yet (as he afterwards shews) this power is mixed with infirmity; this honour oftentimes changed into disgrace. But with the saints above it is much otherwise: "for their power is exceeding great,§ and without any mixture of infirmity." This he illustrates with a story,

* De *Æterna Felicitate* SS. lib. 1. cap. 4.

† Lib. 1. cap. 5. p. 20. Colon. 1626.

‡ See before.

§ Ibid. p. 26.

which at once shews what their power is with reference to us, and how they are prayed to in the Church of Rome upon presumption of it.

“St. Gregory* (says he) relates in his book of Dialogues, that a certain holy man, being just ready to be slain by the hangman, whose arm was stretched out, and sword drawn for that purpose, cried out in that instant, ‘St. John hold him;’ and immediately his hand withered, that he could neither put it down, nor so much as move it. St. John therefore (continues the Cardinal), from the highest heaven heard the voice of his client, and struck his executioner with this infirmity so suddenly, as to hinder the stroke already begun. This is the power of those heavenly kings, that neither the almost infinite distance of place, nor the solitariness of a poor and unarmed righteous man, nor the multitude of armed enemies, could prevent St. John from delivering his *suppliant* from the danger of death.”

32. I shall not need to transcribe what he in the next place adds concerning the worship that upon this and other accounts is paid to the saints, beyond that of any earthly monarch. But from what has been said, I conclude, that it is the opinion of those in the Church of Rome, that as the Council of Trent expresses it, “the saints reign together with Christ;” and are gods by participation; that is, are made partakers of the dignity and power of God. 2. That therefore whatever intercourse the faithful upon earth may have with them, it must be vastly different from what they have with their brethren here below, who are neither admitted to such a dignity, nor partakers of this power. 3. That since the saints are thus kings in heaven, when those of the Roman Church address to them in a *suppliant* manner, as their *clients*, for help and assistance, they do not do this in the same spirit of charity,† nor after the same order of fraternal society with which they would desire the prayers of their fellow Christians yet living. And, 4. That seeing the blessed in heaven have power, together with God, of taking care of us, and bestowing blessings upon us; there is neither truth nor reason in that vain pretence,‡ that all the prayers that are made to them must be reduced to this one form, *pray for us*; but that we ought indeed to understand them to desire of the saints what both their prin-

* Lib. 3. cap. 36.

† Expos. M. de Meaux, sect. 4.

‡ Reply, p. 22.

ciples allow them to do, and their words declare that they do desire ; *viz. their help and assistance*, as reigning *together with Christ*.

33. But, thirdly, I have yet more to say in answer to this evasion. It is well known how much those prayers you make to the saints, scandalized many of the most eminent men of your Church. Wicelius* doubted not to say of one of your hymns, that it was full of downright blasphemy, and horrible superstition ; of others, that they were wholly inexcusable. Ludovicus Vives professed,† that he found little difference in the people's opinion of their saints, in many things, from what the heathens had of their gods : and that numbers in your Church worshipped them no otherwise than God. Now this the Council of Trent could not but know, and it then lay before them to redress it. If therefore those Fathers had thought, that there was no other form of invocation allowable to the saints, than (as you now pretend) to pray to them to pray for us, is it to be imagined, that at such a juncture as this, they would have taken no care about a thing so justly scandalous, not only to the Protestants, whom they desired to reduce, but even to many of their own communion ? How easy had it been for them to say, "that to satisfy the complaints of these learned men, and of their enemies ; and to prevent any mistake of the like kind for the future, it seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to them to declare, that in what terms soever the prayers of their Church were conceived, yet that the ecclesiastical sense of them was in all one and the same, *viz. pray for us.*" But now instead of such a declaration, and which such wise men in this case would never have omitted, they regard no complaints that were made against this service ; but roundly decree an invocation to be due to them, and establish upon the old foundation before mentioned, and which had given rise to all these excesses, *viz. that the saints reign together with Christ* ; and were therefore in a *suppliant manner* to be called upon ; and that for the obtaining benefits of God, they were to fly not only to their prayers, but also to their help and assistance : and when, according to their order for reciting the missals and breviaries, they were again set out, the one four, the other six years after the Coun-

* In Elencho Abusuum. [Fascic. Rer. Exp. et Fug. vol. 2. p. 747. Lond. 1690.]

† Lud. Vives Comm. in S. August. de Civ. Dei, 8. lib. cap. 27. [fol. 106. p. 2. col. 2. Par. 1544.]

cil was ended; the hymns and prayers were left still as we see, and not so much as the least note in a rubric, for a right exposition of them.

34. Nay, I will yet go farther: there was not only no care taken then, but at this day men are suffered to run, without censure, into the same excesses. We know to what extravagance Cardinal Bona, Father Crasset, and but the other day Doctor J. C. our own countryman, have gone; and no one of your Church censures them for it. Cassander, immediately after the Council, no less complained of these things than Vives and Wicelius before, and that too was disregarded. On the contrary, whilst the extravagancies of these votaries are encouraged, the moderation of the others is censured by the highest authority of your Church. The Psalter of St. Bonaventure goes abroad with permission, but the comments of Lud. Vives are put in the Expurgatory Index, and George Cassander's works absolutely prohibited. If advices are given from the blessed Virgin to her indiscreet worshippers, "All the servants of the blessed Virgin run to arms to encounter him:* the learned of all nations write against him, the holy See condemns him, Spain banishes him out of all its dominions, and forbids to read or print his book, as impious and erroneous." But if a Crasset, in his zeal for the mother of God, runs into such blasphemous excesses as no pious ears can hear, without indignation; if he rake together all that the folly and superstition of former ages has said or done the most excessively on this subject, to make up a volume scandalous to that Church and society that endures him: not only the divines of his order approve it, but his Provincial licenses it to be printed; the King's permission is obtained for it; and the expounders themselves are so very good-natured, that they cannot see any harm in it. And then let the world judge what your true doctrine as to the invocation of saints must be. For,

35. Fourthly, Had the Council of Trent been of the same opinion with Monsieur de Meaux, I shall leave it to any reasonable man, that will but be at the pains to examine your offices, to say, whether there was not great need of some such advertisement as I before said. As for example: in the office of the blessed Virgin you thus address to her:

"We fly to your protection, O holy mother of God; despise not our prayers which we make to you in our necessities;

* Crasset, devotion veritable pref. p. 2. [Par. 1679.]

but deliver us from all dangers, O glorious and ever-blessed Virgin."*—And again,

"Vouchsafe that I may be worthy to praise thee, O sacred Virgin : give me strength and power against thine enemies."†

Now that these prayers are conceived in as formal terms as any can be to God himself, is not to be denied : I desire you therefore to tell me by what rules of interpretation, by what public and authentic decree of your Church, we are to expound a prayer made to the blessed Virgin, that she would give strength and power, into a desire that she would pray to God that he would do this ?

36. But however, let us for one moment suppose this to be reasonable, and try whither such a method of interpreting will carry us. For instance, thus you pray to the Apostles :‡

"O ye just judges and true lights of the world, we pray unto you with the requests of our hearts, that ye would hear the prayers of your suppliants."

That is to say, We do desire you in a friendly way, and only after the order of brotherly society, though in compliment we call ourselves indeed your suppliants, and entreat you to hear our prayers, that you would pray for us.

"Ye that by your word shut and open heaven, deliver us, we beseech you, by your *command* from all our sins."

That is, You who by your prayers to God, are able to incline him either to shut or open heaven, we entreat you, that by your *command*, meaning only your prayers, you would deliver us ; that is to say, would pray to God, that he would deliver us—from all our sins.

"You to whose *command* the health and sickness of all men are submitted, heal us who are sick in our manners, and restore us to virtue."

That is to say, O ye holy Apostles, to whose command, as far as prayers may be so called, the health and sickness of all is subjected ; forasmuch as your requests can prevail with God to submit it to you ; heal us, *i. e.* pray to God that he would heal us, who are sick in our manners ; and restore us ; that is to say, entreat God, that he would restore us to virtue.

37. Such, according to your principles, is the paraphrase of this prayer. If this be a natural way of expounding, then be also your pretences allowed of : but if to pray in such

* Officium B. Virg. p. 84. Antw. 1631.

† Ibid. p. 103.

‡ Ibid. p. 497.

words as these, meaning no more than what I have expressed, be a downright mocking both of God and his saints, then let the world judge what we are to think of your interpretations.

38. But, however, for once let us allow even this too: what shall we do with those prayers where God and the saints are both joined together in the same request? As for instance,

“Let Mary and her Son bless us.”*

Here, I doubt it will be something difficult to reduce them to what you call the Church’s sense, *pray for us*, unless you pray to God too as well as to the saints, to pray (to whom I cannot imagine) for you.

39. I shall add but one consideration more, from your service of the saints, to overthrow your new expositions; but that such as I shall be very glad to receive an honest answer to. For be it that in defiance of all sense and reason, your prayers to the saints, in what terms soever they be conceived, must all be interpreted, as you pretend; yet what shall we do in those cases where the very nature of the service utterly refuses such kind of colours? As,

I. When in your vows, you vowed (as I before observed),

“To God, and the blessed Virgin, and to St. Benedict, and to all the saints, that you would be obedient to your superiors.”

II. When in your Doxologies you give

“Glory to God, and the blessed Virgin Mary, and last of all to Jesus Christ.” So Greg. de Valentia.

“Praise be to God, and the Virgin mother Mary, also to God Jesus Christ, the eternal Son of the eternal Father, be praise and glory.” So Cardinal Bellarmine closes this very dispute of the worship of saints.

“Honour and glory be to God, and to the most holy Virgin Mary, and to all the saints.” So your Collector of the lives of the saints.

“*Vers.* Open my lips, O mother of *Jesus*.†

“*Resp.* And my soul shall speak forth thy praise.

“*Vers.* Divine Lady, be intent to my aid.

“*Resp.* Graciously make haste to help me.

“*Vers.* Glory be to *Jesus* and Mary.

“*Resp.* As it *was, is, and ever shall be.*”

So Dr. J. C.† Now what you will think of all this I cannot tell, but sure I am St. Athanasius pronounces it to be

* Officium, B. Virg. p. 105.

† Contemplat. p. 23.

‡ See below.

downright idolatry, and what no good Christian would ever be guilty of.

III. When in your commendation of a departing soul, you bid him,

“Depart out of the world, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; of angels, and archangels, of patriarchs, prophets, apostles, and of all saints;” as I have before at large recited it.*

IV. When in the confession of your sins, you confess,

“To God Almighty, and the blessed Virgin Mary, and to St. Michael the Archangel, to St. John Baptist, to the holy Apostles Peter and Paul, and to all the saints.”†

V. When in absolving your penitents from them, you join,

“The passion of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the merits of the blessed Virgin, and of all the saints together, for the remission of all his sins.”‡

VI. When in your conjurings against storms,

“You contradict the evil spirit by the virtue of our Lord Jesus Christ, and of the blessed Virgin.”§

VII. When in your excommunications, you shut men out of the Church,

“In the authority of God Almighty, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and of the blessed Apostles, Peter and Paul, and of all the saints.”||

VIII. When in absolving them from this sentence, you

“Remit this bond, in the same authority of God Almighty, and of the blessed Apostles, Peter and Paul.”¶

Lastly, when in consecrating of a church or altar, you

“Bid this stone be sancti + fied, and conse + crated, in the name of the Fa + ther, and of the S + on, and of the Holy + Ghost; and of the glorious Virgin Mary, and of all the saints.”** And again,

“Let this Church be sancti + fied, and con + secrated, in the name of the Fa + ther, and of the S + on, and of the Holy + Ghost; to the honour of God, and of the glorious Virgin Mary, and of all the saints.”††

* Rit. Rom. Ord. Com. Anim. [p. 136. Mechlin. 1845.]

† Missale R. in Ord. Miss. [p. 212. Par. 1739.]

‡ Rituale Rom. de Sacr. Pœnit. [ut supra, p. 66.]

§ Rituale Fr. de Sales, p. 77. [Lyon. 1632.]

|| Pontific. Rom. Ord. Excom. et Absolv. [vol. 3. p. 170. Rom. 1740.]

¶ Ibid. [p. 174.]

** Ibid. de Consecrat. Ecclesiæ, p. 124. [vol. 2. p. 75.]

†† Ibid. p. 127.

* Now in all these several instances, there is no room for any such interpretation as you pretend in the case of your prayers; but here either your hearts join in what your lips utter, and then it is plain you give as proper divine worship to the saints as you do to God, which you confess to be unlawful: or if they do not, what is this but to speak words of vanity in your most solemn service, and in which you ought especially to take heed not to offend?

40. Thus do the very words of your Liturgies utterly refuse such an exposition as you pretend to be your only meaning in all your prayers to the saints. I will add yet one consideration more, to shew the insincerity of it, fifthly, from the concurrent practice of the most eminent persons of your Church, and whose authority you cannot with any justice except against.

41. Now of this the famous Psalter of St. Bonaventure may alone serve for a sufficient evidence; which as it has been publicly set forth and authorised amongst you, so I need not tell you, that the design of it was to apply all the addresses that are made to God in the Psalms and Hymns of the Church; nay, and even the very Creeds, to the blessed Virgin.

“Come unto Mary all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and she shall refresh your souls. Come unto her in your temptations, and the serenity of her countenance shall establish you.”*

“When I called upon thee, thou heardest me, O Lady, and from thy high throne didst vouchsafe to remember me. Blessed art thou, O Lady, for ever, and let thy Majesty be exalted for evermore.”†

“O Lady, in thee do I put my trust, deliver my soul from mine enemies. O give thanks unto the Lord, for he is good: O give thanks unto his mother, for her mercy endureth for ever.”‡

42. I might pass at this rate through all the other Psalms,§ and to these add the Te Deum, Benedicite, Athanasian Creed, &c. all burlesqued to her honour: but there have been so many large collections of these already published, that I shall subjoin only one prayer at the close of all.

* Psalterium S. Bonavent. Psalm 2. [vol. 6. p. 502. col. 1. Rom. 1596.]

† Psal. 4. [Ibid. col. 2.]

‡ Psal. 7. [Ibid.] 107.

§ Speculum. B. Virginis, &c.

"O my holy Lady Mary! I commend to thy blessed trust and especial custody, and into the bosom of thy mercy, this day and every day, and in the hour of my death, both my soul and body: I commit all my hope and consolation, all my troubles and my miseries, my life and the end of my life to thee; that by thy most holy intercession and merits, all my works may be directed and disposed, according to *thine* and *thy Son's* will. Amen."

43. I will not now insist upon this, that this book has been often printed among you with licence and commendation, and particularly my editions of it; the one Italian and Latin, printed at Genoa, 1606, with the licence of the Superiors, and submitted by the translator, Giovan Baptista Pinello, to the censure of the Church; the other at Liege in the same year by Le Sage: but this last had the honour of being particularly commended by the Vicar of that Church, and censor of books, as a piece "that was profitable to be printed, and very piously and commendably to be recited by all men in their private prayers, to the honour of the blessed Virgin."* The author of it is at this time a canonized saint in your Church, and is now in his turn worshipped by you. If therefore you approve these addresses (as I presume you must), be pleased to try (it will be a pretty expounding task) how you can reduce all these hymns and prayers to this one sense of your Church, "*pray for us.*" But if you disallow these addresses, as (what in truth they are) scandalous and idolatrous, what then shall we say if you pray to those as in heaven now, who whilst they lived were guilty of such desperate superstitions?

44. And now I am instancing in your saints, I cannot forbear presenting you with a strain or two of your pious, but very superstitious and indiscreet St. Bernard; and this too to try your faculty of expounding.

"To thee, O holy Virgin Mary,† as to the ark of God, as to the cause of things, as to the business of ages, do all look that are both in heaven and hell; both they that are gone before us, and we who now live, and they who shall hereafter be born.—All generations shall call thee blessed, O mother of God!—In thee the angels have found joy, the righteous grace, and sinners pardon for ever. Worthily do the eyes of the whole creation look upon thee, because in thee, and by thee, and of

* Permiss. Jo. Chapeville. Leodii, 17. Nov. 1606.

† Vid. in Psal. S. Bonav. Leodii, 1606. p. 238.

thee the kind hand of the Almighty hath re-created whatever he had created. We embrace thy footsteps, O Mary, and with most devout supplication we fall down before thy blessed feet. We will hold thee, and not let thee go till thou shalt bless us. For thou art able," &c.

45. But I insist too long on these matters, and therefore, instead of multiplying new instances, shall refer you to those I have already offered,* and from your saints descend to the heads of your Church,† one of which thus piously called upon St. Peter and St. Paul, at the head of a Synod, in excommunicating the Emperor Henry IV., anno 1080, in these words :

"Blessed Peter, prince of the Apostles, and thou, O blessed Paul, doctor of the Gentiles! vouchsafe, I beseech you, mercifully to incline your ears unto me, and hear me." And then, after some particulars too large to be transcribed, he thus goes on : "Go to, now, I beseech you, O fathers and holy princes! that all the world may know and understand, that, as you have in heaven the power of binding and loosing, you have also on earth power over empires, kingdoms, principalities, &c. ; for you have often taken away patriarchates, &c. from the wicked and unworthy, and have given them to religious men. Let the kings and all the princes of the world now learn how great you are, and how much you can do, and fear to undervalue the command of your Church : and execute judgment on the aforesaid Henry so suddenly, that all men may know that he shall fall, not by chance, but by your power."

This is a blessed prayer for a Pope to make, and, I doubt, will be found to signify somewhat more than to pray to those saints to pray for him ; if you think otherwise, let us see your paraphrase, and then we shall be able the better to judge of it. To conclude, let any man but read over the late books of Father Crasset and Dr. J. C., and then I will leave him to believe, if he can, that all you mean in your invocation of saints, is only to desire them to pray for you.

46. And this may suffice to your first pretence of the interpretation you would put upon these addresses. As for the authority you would be thought to have from holy Scripture for them, it is so very trifling as not to deserve a consideration.

* Defence, Append. 2. Def. part 1. p. 89.

† Greg. VII. Baron. Ann. ad an. 1080. T. 11. p. 532. [vol. 17. p. 498. col. 1. Luc. 1745.] See Platina, in his Life.

For who would not laugh at that man that should seriously argue after this manner?

1. When the children of Israel were under oppression, God raised up a deliverer or saviour for them, who delivered them: therefore it is lawful to pray to saints as our saviours in heaven.* Again,

2. St. Stephen calls Moses a ruler and a deliverer of the children of Israel, and St. Paul a mediator, because, at the delivery of the law, God sent it by his hands to them: therefore we may now give the titles of mediators and redeemers to the saints departed, with reference to our spiritual and eternal concerns, though they neither are, nor have been, either redeemers or mediators to us.†

3. St. Paul tells Timothy, that, if he discharged the part of a faithful pastor, as he exhorted him to do, he should be a blessed instrument of salvation both to himself and others: therefore we may now pray to Timothy as our saviour in heaven.‡

47. Are not these, Sir, weighty arguments? and were you not resolved utterly to confound us, when you alleged such proof out of holy Scripture as this? But you have one passage, at least, that will do our work:

“Grace and peace are the proper gifts of God; but this St. John wishes to the seven Churches of Asia, not only from God, but also from the seven Spirits which are before the throne: therefore we may warrantably pray to the blessed Virgin, Let the Virgin Mary and her Son bless us.”§

A notable proof this, and almost as terrible as that which follows: “The holy Scripture says of princes, that they are gods; therefore we may pray to the saints as gods too.” But we will consider every part of it. “Grace and peace are the proper gifts of God.” This is confessed: what will you infer from thence? “But these St. John wishes not only from God, but also from the seven Spirits.” I answer, 1. If your own Gloss be good, those seven Spirits are set to signify the seven-fold gifts of the Holy Ghost; || and your own Rhemists, in their annotations (from whence I am apt to believe you borrowed this argument), confess it may be well understood so.¶ But, 2. Not to deal too strictly with you, let us allow

* Judges iii. 9.

† 1 Tim. iv. 16.

|| Gloss. Ord. in loc.

‡ Acts vii. 35. Gal. iii. 19.

§ Revel. i. 4.

¶ Rhemist's Test. p. 700.

these seven Spirits to signify created angels, what will be the consequence? St. John wisheth all grace and peace to the Churches of Asia from God, by the ministration of his holy angels, whose ministry he employs in dispensing his graces and blessings for the preservation of his Church; therefore we may wish to the Church, now, grace and peace from Christ and the blessed Virgin, who is neither angel nor ministering spirit, nor, that we know of, any way employed by God for the service of it. Nay, but this will not do yet; we must carry it yet further. St. John wishes all peace and happiness from God and his holy angels to the Church; therefore we may not only wish the like from God by their ministration, but may solemnly pray to saints and angels themselves, together with God, for grace and peace. And if this be your way of arguing from holy Scripture, it is well you have infallibility of your side, for I am confident, otherwise, you would never persuade any man, by way of reasoning, to submit to your conclusions.

48. But the Representor has yet a passage to justify the utmost extravagance of former times, and prove, even that prayer, which Bellarmine was fain to deny they ever used, "of the Virgin's commanding our Saviour by the right which, as a mother, she had over him," to be most agreeable to holy writ. "For, does not the Scripture say of Joshua (x. 14), that he spake to the sun, and it stood still, the Lord *obeying* the voice of a man?" This is an argument that must be carefully looked to, or, like wit that depends upon a turn of expression, it will be utterly lost. And therefore, in the vulgar Latin and Douay Bibles, this is a good proof, but, in our own, it is none at all; for, as we render it, it would be a most wild inference thus to conclude: Joshua prayed unto God that the sun might stand still, and God hearkened unto his voice, and answered his request; therefore we may pray to the blessed Virgin by the right of a mother to command her Son.

But be it as he desires; God obeyed the voice of Joshua, *i. e.* as the Chaldee paraphrast has it, He accepted his prayer; as the Douay Bible itself expounds it, "He condescended to work so great a miracle at the instance of his servant:" how will it even thence follow, that we may desire the blessed Virgin to command our Saviour by the right of a mother over him? But such twigs as these must be laid hold on, when men are resolved to keep to their conclusion, though, at the

* Douay Bible, in loc. p. 488.

same time, they have not so much as the shadow of a proof to support it.

SECT. II.

*After what manner it is that the Church of Rome prays to God through the merits of her Saints.**

This is the next point to be considered by us ; and thus you establish it :

49. *Reply*, p. 23.] “ You tell us, that the word merit is equivocal, and misapplied by me ; that the truth of your doctrine is : I. To reduce all your prayers to this form, that God would be pleased not to regard your unworthiness, but (the merits of our Redeemer ever supposed) respect the merits of his saints also, and for their sakes hear your prayers, and accept your sacrifices. II. That this is plainly shewn in your solemn concluding of all your addresses in this manner, Through Jesus Christ our Lord ; whereby it appears, that you mean no more than to beg of God Almighty that he would vouchsafe to call to mind the glorious actions and sufferings of his saints, performed in and by his grace, and upon these accounts accept you. III. And, finally, That for this you have the authority of the holy Scripture itself.”

50. *Ans.*] For answer to which discourse, I must first desire you to come a little out of the clouds, and not play with us in ambiguous terms whilst you charge me with it. The word merit, you say, is equivocal, and the two senses you give it are, first, to signify that we do, by our own natural force alone, deserve the reward of grace and glory, and in which sense, if you pretend that we charge you with pleading your own merits, you do certainly most falsely accuse us. The other sense you give the word is, that our good works may be said to merit, because they apply the merits of Jesus Christ to us, and are the means by which we attain eternal life, in virtue of the promises of God, and merits of our blessed Redeemer; in which, were you sincere (for all the impropriety of the speech), yet we should not be far from agreeing with you. But now, what is all this to your praying to God to hear you by the merits of the saints ? This may do well in its proper article, but here it serves only to amuse the reader with that which is nothing to

* Reply, sect. 18. p. 23, 24.

the purpose, that so he may be disposed to forget what you were to prove. *Jam dic posthume de tribus capellis.*

51. You tell us, then, in the next paragraph, that you pray "that God would not respect your own unworthiness, but regard the merits of his saints, and for their sakes, *i. e.* for their merits, hear your prayers, or accept your sacrifices."* But where, then, is the misrepresentation? For this is the very thing we charge you with, *viz.* that not content to address yourselves to God, in the name and through the merits of our *only* Mediator, Jesus Christ, you have sought out to yourselves other intercessors, in whose name, and through whose merits, to offer up both your prayers and sacrifices to God; and whether we do not in this very justly accuse you, let your addresses themselves satisfy the world.

"O, blessed John the Baptist! reach out thy hand to us, and be to us continually a holy intercessor to the clemency of the most high Judge, that through *thy merits* we may *deserve* to be freed from all tribulation."

"O God! by whose grace we celebrate the memories of thy Saturninus and Sisinnius, grant that by their *merit* we may be helped, through our Lord.

"Mercifully accept, O God, our offerings which we have made unto thee, for the *sake* of the passion of thy blessed martyrs Saturninus and Sisinnius; that by their intercession they may be made acceptable to thy majesty."

And in the Breviary of Salisbury, we find this to be a part of the constant service:

"Be propitious, we beseech thee, O Lord, unto us thy servants, through the glorious merits of thy saints whose relics are contained in this church; that by their pious intercession we may be protected in all adversities.

"Grant, we beseech thee, Almighty God, that the merits of thy saints whose relics are contained in this church, may protect us, &c."†

It were infinite to recount all the other prayers which run in the same strain throughout all your offices, insomuch that the very canon ‡ of the mass is infected with it. I will mention only one instance more, which is indeed a singular one; not so much because of the expression of it, wherein the general

* Reply, p. 24.

† Breviarium in usum Sarum in Servit. B. Virg. par. 2.

‡ Missal. Rom. p. 367. [p. 231. Par. 1739.]

word *merit* is restrained to the particular merit of his death, as because it was made to one who died in actual rebellion against his prince ; and concerning whom, therefore, it was for some time debated amongst you, whether he were damned or saved ?

“ *By the blood of Thomas (à Becket) which he shed for Thee, make us to ascend to heaven whither he is gone.*”*

52. It remains then, that you recur to the saints not merely for their prayers, but that by their merits and intercession they would obtain grace and pardon of God for you. This is the doctrine of your Catechism: “That the saints help us by their own merits, and are therefore the rather to be worshipped and invoked, because they both pray continually for the salvation of men, and that God bestows many benefits upon us by their merit and favour.”† It is from hence that the Master of the Sentences interprets your praying for their intercession, to be the same thing as to pray that by their merits they would help you. And Aquinas:‡ “We pray to the saints (says he), not to inform God of our petitions by them, but that by their *prayers* and *merits* our prayers may become effectual.” “We may say to the saints (says Cardinal Bellarmine), § Save me, or Give me this or that ; provided we understand, Give it me by thy prayers or merits.” So that in all this we say no more of you, than what both your doctrine and practice warrant us to do.

53. Let us see, therefore, how you excuse yourselves in this matter. You say, “that your concluding of all your prayers through Jesus Christ our Lord, shews that you desire all at last by his merits.” But indeed this is but a poor shift ; and as a very learned man || has long since told you, that close comes in in your addresses, much after the same manner that the mention of a certain sum of money does in deeds of trust, only *pro formâ* : and you are nevertheless guilty for this conclusion, of what we charge you with, *viz.* That you join the merits and intercession of the saints with the merits and intercession of Christ for pardon and acceptance. And to this end, that you may see what senseless petitions you hereby make

* Mornay de la Messe, p. 826. Saumur, 1604.

† Catech. Trid. par. 3. p. 256. [p. 357. Mechlin. 1831.] de Invoc. SS. n. 24. tit. Sancti suis Meritis non adjuvant.

‡ Aquin. 2da. q. 83. art. 4. [vol. 22. p. 343. col. 2. Venet. 1787.]

§ Bellarmin. de Beat. l. 1. c. 17.

Dr. Jackson, tom. 1. p. 941. [Lond. 1673.]

to God in these addresses, I will only take one of your prayers in the literal meaning of it,* and apply it in a plain paraphrase to your pretensions, by way of petition to some earthly prince. Thus then you pray upon the 3rd of May:

“Grant, we beseech thee, Almighty God, that we who adore the nativity of thy saints, Alexander, &c. may by their intercession be delivered from all evils that hang over us, through Jesus Christ our Lord.”

Now, changing only the names, this, according to your Exposition, will be the paraphrase of it:

“I beseech your sacred majesty that you would vouchsafe to pardon my offences against you, and deliver me from those evils that hang over me for them, at the intercession of your lord chancellor, &c., and in honour of this his birthday; and that for the sake of the prince your son, our royal lord and master.”

In this extravagant petition, the very transcript of the foregoing prayer, he must be blind who sees not that the conclusion of it, for the prince's sake, &c. is very impertinent, and does not at all hinder but that the request is formally made by the interest of my lord chancellor, and in honour of his birthday: and therefore that notwithstanding this conclusion (which is really the remains of your old forms, before ever any new intercessors were put into them), you remain justly chargeable with what I accuse you of, that you make the saints joint intercessors with Christ to God; and desire not only through his merits, but by theirs also, to obtain your requests.

54. As for your last pretence of holy Scripture for this practice, it is every jot as little to the purpose in this, as I have shewn it to be in the foregoing point.

1. “God tells Isaac † (say you) that he would bless him for his father Abraham's sake. Moses, praying for the people, desires God to remember Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob;” *i. e.*

Because God, in pursuance of his covenant made with Abraham, blessed his son, and Moses put him in mind of that covenant, to appease his anger, that he should not destroy the Israelites; therefore it is lawful now to pray to God not only by the merits of Christ (the only Mediator of God's covenant with us), but also of the saints too, for pardon and salvation.

2. “God, ‡ in remembrance of his promise made to David,

* *Idem. ib.*

† Reply, p. 25.

‡ Reply, *ib.*

shewed mercy unto Solomon for his sake : therefore Solomon might have urged to God the merits of David for pardon of his sins ; and therefore we (who have another and better, and only Advocate) may address to God by the merits and intercession of the saints for forgiveness."

I wonder you did not put in the city Jerusalem's merits too, to prove that we may not only pray through the merits of the saints, but of their cities also : for the text seems as express in this as in the other : 1 Kings xi. 32. " But he shall have one tribe for my servant David's sake, and for Jerusalem's sake, the city which I have chosen out of all the tribes of Israel."

3. What you mean by your last passage,* I must confess I cannot divine ; unless you think that because Elijah, who was sent by God's express command to make a proof of his divinity before all the people of Israel, who were gone after Baal, began his prayer with that usual character of his being the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob ; it was therefore through their merits that the fire came down from heaven, and burnt up his sacrifice.

SECT. III.

In which the Arguments offered by the Vindicator for the establishing of this Worship are particularly considered, and their weakness laid open.

55. Hitherto we have been clearing the matter of fact, what your practice in this invocation of saints is ; I come now in the next place to examine your arguments, and see what grounds you have to support so great a superstition.

And, first, For what concerns the holy Scripture, I find you do not much care to be tried by that : you plead possession for your warrant, and are resolved that shall be sufficient, till we by some better right can throw you out of it. Now in this I cannot but commend your discretion ; for indeed those who go about to found this article upon the authority of Holy Writ, do in the opinion of many of your own Church but lose their labour, since (as they tell us) for the Old Testament,† the holy patriarchs and prophets that lived before Christ's incarnation, were not admitted into heaven, and therefore were not capable of being prayed to ; and for the New, it was not expressed there for fear of scandalizing the Jews, and lest the

* Reply, ib.

† See Defence of the Expos. p. 8. in annot.

Gentiles should have been thereby moved to think, that the worship of new gods had been proposed to them.

59. Wherefore, passing by the holy Scripture, which you look upon as unfit to be appealed to in this case, let us come to the possession you so much boast of; and see how you defend it against those arguments I offered, to prove "that this custom of calling upon the saints had no footing in the Church before the latter end of the fourth century; and was then but beginning to creep into it."* And to reduce your confusion to the clearest method I can, I will distinctly consider your allegations in these two periods.

First, Of the first three hundred years, wherein I affirm that there was no such practice in the Church.

Secondly, Of the fourth century, towards the latter end of which I confess it began to appear, though still with very great difference from what you now practise.

FIRST PERIOD.

That the Custom of praying to Saints had no^{} being in the Church for the first three hundred years.*

57. Now for this I have shewed you in my Defence, "that the Fathers of the fourth century did herein certainly depart from the practice and tradition of the ages before them; because—That you were not able to produce so much as one instance out of the first three centuries of any such invocation:—But rather were forced to confess, that nothing of that kind was to be found amongst them.—That this was in effect what your greatest authors, Card. du Perron, Card. Bellarmine, and even the Bishop of Meaux himself had done:—And that indeed your own principles oblige you to this acknowledgment; seeing you both allow that without believing that the saints departed go forthwith to heaven, they could not have prayed to them; and yet cannot but say that this, the holy Fathers of the three first ages did utterly deny."† These were my arguments; let us see how you clear your possession from the force of them.

58. First, You clap a marginal note upon my assertion (in earnest of your future civility), "Primitive Fathers *calumniated* by the Defender:"‡ and to wipe off this calumny, you under-

* Defence, ib.

† Defence of the Expos. Art. 3. p. 6.

‡ Reply, p. 17. §. 13.

take to shew that they did pray to the saints within the first 300 years. This is I confess to the purpose, and if you can do it, let the note of calumny stick upon me; but indeed I rather think that this undertaking will fix another, and a much more proper note upon you. But let us hear your proofs.

Ibid.] And first you say, "My brethren the Centurists of Magdeburg acknowledge that Origen prayed to Job, and admitted the invocation of angels."

59. *Answer.*] If this be true, then, Sir, I tell you in one word, that my brethren the Centurists were mistaken; and that (considering the time they wrote in) is no great wonder. But now did you never hear in your life, that your brethren, Erasmus, Sextus Senensis, Possevin, Bellarmine, Baronius, Labbé, Du Pin, &c. have all confessed, that neither the Tracts, nor Comments upon Job were Origen's? Has no one ever told you, secondly, that another of your brethren, Card. du Perron,* has utterly rejected the authority of Origen, as an incompetent witness in matter of fact, and that especially in the very point before us? Were you indeed so ignorant, thirdly, as not to know how opposite this Father is to you (as I shall presently shew), in his undoubtedly genuine works as to this matter? As for the other passages you quote, fourthly, out of his Comments upon Ezekiel; besides that he there supposes the angel present with him: could you look upon this place, and not see that another of your brethren, your own editor, calls it an apostrophe to his guardian angel; and I desire you to try if you can make any more of it. And, lastly, for what you finally allege out of his Lamentations; did you in good earnest not know that it was a book marked, not by your brethren only, but by your holy father Pope Gelasius, as apocryphal; and rejected as such by all the learned men of your own communion? So unfortunate, or rather unfaithful, have you been in your first entry upon antiquity. It may be you will go on a little better.

Reply.] You tell us in the next place a story of one Justina, "how being in danger of making shipwreck of her chastity by the magical art of St. Cyprian, she had recourse to the intercession of the blessed Virgin Mary, begging of her to assist her whose virginity was in danger."†

* *Replique au Roy de la Grande Bretagne*, liv. v. c. 13. p. 982. [Par. 1620.]

† *Reply*, p. 17. n. 14.

60. *Answer.*] If by this story you design to prove the invocation of saints to have been the practice of the Church within the first 300 years (and indeed it is for this you do produce it), I must then again complain of your insincerity; seeing it is both acknowledged by your own authors,* and indeed confessed by your ownself, that Gregory Nazianzen was mistaken in the relation, and attributed that to the great St. Cyprian, bishop of Carthage, which could not belong to him. As for the other Cyprian,† to whom Cardinal du Perron, Baronius, &c. apply it, he is not pretended to have lived within that period, and so your proof is without the compass of what you undertook to shew.

61. But, secondly, had there been any truth in this story, even with reference to this other Cyprian, how comes it to pass that none of the ancient Martyrologies, no not your own Breviary, since the reformation of it, makes the least mention of any such thing? Would all these have omitted so considerable a passage, had there been any grounds of certainty in it?

62. To reply therefore to this instance, I say, it is more than probable that St. Gregory took up this story either from some lying report, or out of some counterfeit acts: for one part of it, that which relates to St. Cyprian, bishop of Carthage, you confess‡ your selves that in this he was certainly mistaken; and of any other Cyprian, we hear nothing either in Eusebius, or any other historian or writer of that age: the first Cardinal Baronius has produced being Beda and Adelhelmus, who lived not till the eighth, and Metaphrastes in the latter end of the ninth century. But however let us see even what they say of this matter. They tell us that the Cyprian here meant was Bishop of Antioch, and suffered martyrdom at Nicomedia with St. Justina: and thus it stood in your own Breviary too, till the reformation of it by the order of the Council of Trent.§ But now it is beyond dispute evident that this is utterly false; for that in those times there was no such Bishop of Antioch, both the accounts of the succession of that see given us both by ancient and modern historians plainly shew; and Cardinal

* Reply, p. 17.

† See Baron. Mart. ad 26. Sept. p. 376. Edit. Paris. 1613. Et Annal. ad ann. 250. n. 5. [vol. 2. p. 564. col. 2. Luc. 1738.]

‡ Baronius calls it *Explodenda Fabula* ad ann. 250. n. 5. [Ibid.] Billius *cæcutiisse hic Gregorium in Orat. Annot. Vid. in Martyr. ubi supr.*

§ Vid. in Brev. Eccles. Sarisb. ad 26. Sept.

Baronius himself confesses it : who is therefore forced for the credit of the business, contrary both to his own authors and to your* ancient Breviaries, to degrade him from a Bishop to a Deacon. And for this he has no authority. So evident does it remain, that this whole matter is what the Cardinal calls, one part of it at least, a fable to be exploded by all wise men. And this is another proof either of your integrity or ability in Church-history. But we will hope the next may be better.

63. *Reply.*] And thus you go on with your undertaking : † “ You tell me you do not cite Dionysius the Areopagite, because it may be I will not allow him to be the author of the book under his name : nor Justin Martyr, because I shall be apt to say he does not speak plain enough : nor Irenæus, though he says plainly that the Virgin Mary was made an advocate for the Virgin Eve (I presume you mean that Eve prayed to the Virgin Mary 4000 years before she was born, as Father Crasset‡ says, they built temples to her ere she came into the world) because it may be, I shall find out an evasion for that too.”

64. *Answ.*] *Quid dignum tanto feret hic promissor hiatu?* § You will not insist upon Dionysius, nor upon Justin Martyr, nor upon Irenæus : but what then will you insist upon? for you have said nothing at all to the purpose yet.

After all this gaping, we have two testimonies only offered to us for the practice of 300 years : one a passage of Origen already rejected as spurious ; and the other out of a tract of Methodius, if not certainly spurious, yet justly suspected by your own critics, being neither quoted by any of the ancients, nor mentioned by Photius ; and of a style more luxuriant than that Father's other writings are ; and that speaks so clearly of the mystery of the Trinity, of the incarnation and divinity of the Word, whom he calls, in a phrase not well known in his time, *consubstantial* with the Father ; of the Trisagion never heard of for above 100 years after his death ; of the Virginity|| of Mary after her conception ; and of original sin ; that your late critic, Monsieur du Pin, had certainly reason to place it among his spurious works, however it be now cited with such assurance by you.

65. But to quit this exception against the book : the very

* Ibid.

† Reply, *ibid.* p. 19.

‡ Crasset, par. 2. Trait. 4. qu. 3. p. 99. Par. 1679.]

§ Horace de Art. Poet.

|| Bibliotheque, T. 1. p. 530.

passage itself is so manifest a piece of oratory, that had you ever consulted it, in the Greek set out by Combefis, you could not have doubted of it. He had begun his apostrophe two or three pages before what you produce; and he ushered it in with this express introduction to prepare us for it,* "that he would conclude his speech with an address to the city of the great King, and to all his Brethren and Fathers there, as if they were now present with him: and accordingly he apostrophes the city Jerusalem, p. 426. The whole Catholic Church, p. 428. A. All the people of God, *ibid.* B. The blessed Virgin, *ibid.* C. Holy Simeon, p. 429. B. And so concludes all, joining with that blessed man in his address to our Saviour Christ." And though his expressions may be very high (as the whole sermon is), yet we cannot but think it very unreasonable to conclude the dogmatical sense of the Church, from the rhetorical flights of a single man, were the piece otherwise never so genuine: but indeed it is worthily rejected (for the reasons before mentioned) by the learned critics both of your and our communion.

66. This then is the sum of your arguments, to establish this practice in the first three centuries. Were it necessary, after what has been done by so many better hands, to recount the opinions of those holy Fathers as to this point, I should certainly be able to make some better proof of the antiquity of our praying to God only, than you have been able to do of your addressing to the blessed Virgin and to the saints.

67. In the Epistle of the Church of Smyrna concerning the death of Polycarp, Anno 167, we find that the Jews had persuaded the heathens, that if they suffered the Christians to have the body of that holy martyr, they would leave Christ to worship Polycarp:† "Not knowing (says that letter) that it is not possible to leave Christ, who hath suffered for the salvation of all those that are saved in the world; nor to serve or religiously adore any other. For as for Jesus Christ, we adore him as being the Son of God. But as for the martyrs, we love them as the disciples and imitators of the Lord. And that very justly, considering their insuperable zeal which they bore to their King and Master, and God grant that we may be both the disciples of their piety, and partakers of their glory."

* Methodius Gl. Edit. Combefis. Paris cum S. Amphilochio, 1644.

† Apud Euseb. Eccles. Hist. lib. 4. c. 15. p. 109. B. Ed. 2. Vales. Paris. 1678.

68. This is indeed the true spirit of Christianity, and the exact account of the honour we now pay to the saints. We adore only our Saviour Christ, as the Son of God, and therefore (as the ancient* Latin translation of this letter reads it) we pray to no another. But for the saints, we love and honour them; we recite and magnify their noble acts; we encourage ourselves by their examples to the like performances, as those who earnestly desire to be partakers of their glory. This is all the honour they are now capable of receiving; and this was all that the Primitive Church in those best ages was ever known to have given to them.

69. The Church of Christ (says Irenæus†) does nothing “by the invocation of angels, nor by any other perverse curiosity; but by addressing her prayers purely, and only, and openly to the Lord who has made all things.”

70. Origen tells us, that to invoke the Lord, and to adore God, are the same thing.‡ So do Tertullian and Cyprian, using the words *to pray* and *to adore* promiscuously in the same signification. In a word, this was the constant doctrine of those first ages; and I will choose to deliver it in the words of that Father whom you have especially alleged to the contrary: “We worship,” says Origen, “the one only God, and his one only Son, and Word and Similitude,§ with our utmost supplications and honours; bringing our prayers to the God of all things, through his only begotten Son.—We must pray to God only, who is over all, and to his only begotten Son the first-born of every creature,|| and beseech him as our High Priest to carry our prayers which we make to him, to his God, and our God, to his Father, and the Father of all those that live according to the Word of God.—This is our profession of faith, which we constantly maintain as long as we live, by the blessing of God, and of his only Son Jesus Christ, who was manifested amongst us.¶ As for the favour of others (if that be to be looked after), we know that thousand of thousands stand before him, and ten thousand times ten thousand minister unto him. These as our brethren and friends, when they see us imitating their piety towards God,

* Edit. Usser.

† Irenæus, lib. ii. c. 57. p. 218. Ed. Paris. 1675.

‡ In Rom. l. 8. c. 10. Tertull. de Orat. cap. 1. [p. 129. par. 1695] Cyp. de Orat. Dom. [p. 414, 415. Venet. 1728.]

§ Orig. contr. Cels. lib. 8. p. 386. Ed. Cantabr. anno. 1658.

|| Ibid. 395.

¶ Ibid. p. 400.

work together to the salvation of those that *call upon God*, and *pray* as they *ought* to do."

71. I will add but one testimony more in a matter both so plain in itself, and so often insisted upon by others, and it is of Novatian proving the divinity of Christ,* from the churches praying to him, "For none but God," says he, "knows the secrets of the heart as our Saviour did. If Christ be only a man, how is he every where present to those that call upon him? Seeing this is not the nature of a man, but of God, to be able to be present in every place. If Christ be only man, why is a man called upon as a mediator in prayers, seeing the calling upon a man is judged of no value to give salvation? If Christ be only man, why is any hope put in him, seeing that hope is represented as accursed that is placed in man?"

72. Such was the opinion of the Church in the first three centuries. As for that extraordinary discovery you are pleased next to make, "That all you do in your Liturgies is, to beg of God to hear the prayers of his saints,† and that for this you are able to furnish me with many examples out of the ancient Liturgies and Fathers within the first 100 years:" it is so false an assertion, and so vain an undertaking, that either you must be ignorant even unto astonishment both in the doctrine of your own Church, and in the acts of primitive antiquity, or else most certainly you never believed, either what you say, or what you promise.

73. But though you are not then able to answer my challenge of producing any warrant from the Fathers of the first 300 years for this doctrine and practice, it may be you are able at least to answer my presumption from those times against it, *viz.* :—"That those Fathers did not believe that the souls of the just went straight to heaven, and therefore by your own principles could not have believed that they ought to be prayed to as there."

74. *Reply.*] To this you say, "That you are not bound to defend every argument that Bellarmine and Suarez bring,‡ especially when others of your writers think them unconvincing. In short, you cannot deny the matter of fact, though you would be thought to suppose rather than allow it to be true. And all you have to say is, that whatever they believed besides, sure you are they did pray to the saints."

* Novatian de Trinitate, c. 13. p. 17. A. Ibid. C. D. ad fin. Tertull. Paris. 1675.

† Reply, p. 19. Sect. 14.

‡ Reply, p. 15. §. 12.

75. *Answ.*] That the Fathers about the latter end of the fourth century began to invoke the saints, we do not deny; though it were rather in the way of a rhetorical compellation, than of a formal address. And if herein they contradicted any other of their principles, we know they were but men, and as such might possibly in their religious heats do some things not entirely consonant to themselves in their cooler hours. Now then taking it for granted that those Fathers I heretofore mentioned, did teach that the saints departed do not yet enjoy the beatific vision, I say with those great men of your Church, whom you here forsake, that they could not reasonably pray to them, since it is upon this vision especially that you found your opinion of that particular knowledge you suppose they ordinarily and constantly have of those things that are done here below, and without which it would be vain and absurd to call upon them. And, therefore, though you have no regard to Bellarmine's or Suarez's authority, yet for the sake of sense and reason answer their arguments; and tell us a little, upon your own principles, how those Fathers could think the saints were fit to be prayed to, if by denying them to be yet in heaven, they by consequence must have denied them to have any ordinary and certain knowledge of what is done here upon earth?

76. *Reply.*] "But Sixtus Senensis, you say, after all concludes, that those Fathers do not intend to exclude the saints departed from the beatific vision, but only from that perfect happiness which we shall enjoy after the resurrection.* And it would have been much more Christian-like in me, to have imitated his example, than to argue as I do, against their praying to saints from this principle."

77. *Answ.*] Had I been cramped, as he was, with a *definitus* of my Church, I might possibly have been tempted to make excuses for those Fathers, as he did. But a man need only look upon their words, as they are cited by him, to see how little such shuffling will avail, to reduce their doctrine to your pretences. And the truth is, this Sixtus Senensis was so honest as to confess, though you were not so honest as to take notice of it. For having offered that exposition of their words which you mention, he immediately subjoins: "Thus," says he, "have I interpreted the expressions of St. Ambrose, Austin, and Chrysostom. But if there be some sayings of the holy authors which cannot suffer such an interpretation, yet

* Reply, p. 16.

we should at least remember that this *error* ought not to prejudice the learning and piety of such illustrious Fathers, seeing the Church in their time had not yet determined any thing certain to be believed in this matter." Thus Sixtus Senensis; ingenuously confessing how the case stood. And this you cannot be presumed not to have seen in him, seeing they are in the very same place with what you transcribed from him. And what then must I think of such a one as values not how he reports things, so he may but by any means seem to say somewhat, though he knows at the same time that he cannot expect long to triumph in his insincerity.

78. And now there is but one thing more remaining, to get over this unlucky period of the first 300 years.

Reply.] "For what, if the few writings of the ancients of the first 300 years which remain be silent in this particular, does it follow that they approved not the practice?"*

Ans.] No, sir, this is not the case. We do not pretend to a bare silence of those holy Fathers, but we produce their express authorities against you; and that I hope is a good argument that our possession is at least 300 years better than yours; and that you, not we, have been innovators in this particular.

79. *Reply.*] "Had this custom of praying to saints been only introduced in the fourth age, and been so dangerous as moderns would persuade the world that it is, certainly the succeeding General Councils would have taken notice of it, or some one of the Fathers would have written against it.† But, on the contrary, we find the fourth General Council allowing this invocation in the third person, 'Let Flavian the Martyr pray for us.'"

80. *Ans.*] To your instance from the fourth General Council, I reply: That besides that you yourself confess that it is nothing to the purpose, there being a mighty difference between wishing that the saints would pray for us, and praying to the saints for their aid and succour, you should have known that this Council was held in the middle of the fourth age, and so is without the compass of what I am here to consider.

81. But I will go yet farther with you as to this instance; and to that end I must tell you, that your authors have very much deceived you in their accounts of it. For, first, It was not the Synod, but only a party in that Synod, that cried out, "Let Flavian the Martyr pray for us." And, secondly, Even

* *Reply*, p. 18. sect. 14.

† *Ibid.*

they that did cry out thus, were as far from designing to pray to Flavian at all, as you were from understanding the meaning of their exclamation. The occasion of those words in short was this :* In the eleventh and twelfth actions of that Council there arose a difficult debate concerning Bassianus and Stephanus, whether of the two was lawful bishop of Ephesus. Bassian had this plea, that he had held it quietly four years ; that Proclus and his successors, bishops of Constantinople, had communicated with him as lawful bishop of that see ; among whom was Flavianus, but lately deceased. Upon this the Fathers that were of Bassianus' party urged to the Synod, that Flavian by communicating with him, had acknowledged him to be lawful Bishop of Ephesus ; and thereupon press the holy bishops to have this respect to Flavian, a catholic and martyr, as to acknowledge Bassianus to be the true bishop, seeing he had communicated with him as such. And here comes in, among other expressions, this that is the subject of our present debate. The bishops and clergy of Constantinople cry out, in honour of their late martyr, "This is the truth ; this we all say : let the memory of Flavian be eternal ; let the memory of the orthodox Flavian be eternal ; Flavian lives after his death ; let the martyr pray (or entreat) for us ; Flavian judges with us." This was the occasion of those words ; and it plainly shews, that all they meant by them was, that the judgment of Flavian, a holy bishop and martyr, should prevail with the Synod to judge of Bassianus's side, with whom he had communicated.

82. As for your argument, that had this custom of praying to saints been introduced in the fourth age, it would certainly have been condemned in the following : I reply, first, That this is at most but a mere presumption, against plain and undoubted matter of fact, and such as not only this, but too many other corruptions which have crept into the Church, without any notable opposition for some time made to them, abundantly overthrows. But, secondly, Though your argument therefore, if we should allow it, would be good for little ; yet it has another misfortune too, which most of your proofs labour under, that it is as false as it is inconclusive. For, good sir, did you never in your inquiry into these matters, hear of such a canon as the thirty-fifth of the Council of Laodicea, Anno 364, expressly condemning the worship of angels ? Did you never meet with such an order as that of the

* Labbe, Conc. tom. 4. Act. 11. p. 697. B. [Lut. Par. 1671.]

third Council of Carthage,* in St. Austin's time, commanding all the prayers that were made at the altar to be directed to the Father? At least I am confident you cannot be ignorant what Vigilantius did in opposition to this superstition; and whose piety St. Jerome himself, though his hot antagonist, could not but acknowledge. Nor was he alone in this quarrel; St. Jerome speaks of several bishops that were of his party, and joined with him in his endeavours against this growing evil. Even St. Austin† himself, as appears from many places in his works, spoke not a little contrary to it, and plainly insinuates he would have done more, had not this practice already so possessed men's minds, that it was not safe so to do.

83. But to quit all these: the public declaration which Epiphanius made against the Collyridians (a sort of women in those days, superstitious in their honour of the blessed Virgin) is alone enough to shew, that this practice did not pass without opposition in those times. "It is true," says he, "the body of Mary was holy, but she was not therefore God.‡ She was a virgin, and highly honoured, but she was not set forth to us to be worshipped; but she herself worshipped him who was born of her flesh. And therefore the holy Gospel has herein armed us beforehand, our Lord himself saying, 'Woman, what have I to do with thee?'§ Wherefore does he say this, but only lest some should think of the blessed Virgin more highly than they ought? He called her woman, as it were foretelling those schisms and heresies that should arise upon her account.—But neither is Elias to be adored, though he be yet alive: nor is St. John to be adored,|| nor Tecla, nor any of the saints; if God will not permit us to worship angels, how much less the daughter of Anna?—Let Mary be held in honour, but let the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost be worshipped.¶ Let no one worship Mary; ** for though she were most fair, and holy, and honourable, yet she is not therefore to be adored. In a word, let Mary be held in honour, but let God be adored."††

84. To conclude this point, you tell us:

Reply.] "That it seems most extravagant to you that Protestants should demand of you to shew them some testimonies of the Fathers of the first three hundred years, who lived

* Can. 23.

† Vid. Epist. ad Januar. Ep. 119. [vol. 2. p. 142. Par. 1679.]

‡ Epiphan. Hæres. 79. p. 1061. C. D. Colon. 1682.]

§ Joh. 2.

|| Ib. 1062. C.

¶ Ib. 1064. D.

** [Ibid. 1065. B.

†† Ib. 1066. D.

under persecution, few of whose writings remain, the greatest part being lost and destroyed, and yet reject the Fathers of the fourth age, who wrote when the Church began first to be in a flourishing condition. Can any one imagine that the Church, when in grots and caverns, taught one thing, and, when she came into the light, practised another?""*

85. *Ans.*] What mere harangue is this? But we must be contented where better is not to be had. And therefore I reply, first, as to your insinuation, which, since Cardinal Perron first invented it, has been the constant common-place of the little crowd of controvertists that have followed after, *viz.* that the Fathers of the first three hundred years lived under persecution, and therefore wrote but little, and of that little the greatest part was lost too; though I can easily excuse this in you as a sin of ignorance, yet I must needs say of the Cardinal and others, that they have herein greatly injured those holy men, who were neither so lazy nor fearful as they have represented them to have been.

86. For, not to say any thing of the foundation of all our religion, the holy Scriptures, which were written within this period, how large a catalogue has Eusebius alone preserved of the works of those holy Fathers, and yet how many of the Latin Church has he omitted! Look into his History, and there you will find those great names, Clemens Romanus, Papias, Quadratus, Aristides, Hegesippus, Justin Martyr, Dionysius of Corinth, Pinytus, Apollinarius, Melito, Modestus, Irenæus, Theophilus, Tatian, Bardesanes, Clemens Alexandrinus, Rhodo, Miltiades, Apollonius, Serapion, Heraclitus, Moscarinus, Candidus, Sextus, and Arabien, all to have been writers of the second century; Tertullian, Judas, Beryllus, Hippolytus, Caius, Africanus, Dionysius Alexandrinus, Nepos, Cyprian, Origen, in the third; and the writings of which last author only were said to have amounted to six thousand volumes, and which though St. Jerome retrenched to a third part, yet still he left two thousand to him.

87. In what sort of writings were these holy men defective? Some published Apologies for our religion; others disputed against the heathens, the Jews, the heretics of those times. Some wrote of the discipline of the Church; others, moral discourses, for the direction of men's lives and manners. Their histories, their accounts of the holy men who suffered

* Reply, p. 18.

for the faith, their comments on the holy Scripture, their sermons, are yet upon record. And when such was their diligence, why should it be insinuated as if, living under persecution, they wrote but little, and therefore that it is unreasonable to appeal to them?

88. Nor is your next pretence any better, that their writings are lost and destroyed; for though it be, indeed, in great measure true, that, in respect of what they wrote, there is but a small part brought down to us (and we have some reason to believe, that the opposition they made to your corruptions has been, in some measure, the cause of it*), yet have we still enough to shew us what the faith of those times was, and how vastly you have declined from it; and when both the writings of holy Scripture, and of those Fathers that do remain, speak so plainly against you, we have no great reason to believe that those which are lost were at all more favourable to you.

89. But can any one imagine that the Church, when in grottos and caverns, should teach one thing, and, when it came into the light, practise another?† I answer, yes; this is very easy to be imagined: affliction keeps men close to their duty, whereas prosperity too often corrupts the best manners. When it pleased God to convert the empire to Christianity, there were but too many instances of heathen customs accommodated to the principles of the Gospel: and this was one; whether it were that they could not so soon forget their ancient rites, or that they thought it a religious policy to extend the pale of the Church, by suiting Christianity as much to the heathen ceremonies as it was possible, and to dispose men thereby the more readily to embrace it; or whether, finally, that simplicity of the Gospel, which suited well enough with a state of persecution, was now thought too mean for an established Church, the religion of the Emperor, and they were therefore willing to render it more pompous, and set it off with greater lustre in the eyes of men, though, in so doing, they a little departed from the purity of their lower and better state.

90. Let us add to this, the opinion which then began to prevail among those holy Fathers, of the particular intercession of the saints for us, and which both the prayers that were made in those days at the memories of the martyrs, and the miracles God was sometimes pleased to work there, not to say anything of the visions and apparitions that were sometimes

* Def. of the Expos.
VOL. XIII.

† Reply, p. 18.
F

thought to be seen there, very much confirmed them in. Now this naturally prepared the way for the invocation which followed upon it; for now the poets began, instead of their Muses, to call (more Christianly) upon the saints and martyrs to assist them. The orators, following the genius of the age, indulged themselves all the liberty of their eloquence in apostrophes to the saints at their memories; and, as things seldom stop in their first beginnings, by degrees, through the ignorance of some, and superstition of more, they fell into a formal invocation about the beginning of the fourth century.

91. But here another accident fell out for the carrying on of this service; for, about this time, Nestorius began to teach that men ought not to call the blessed Virgin the mother of God. Now this made some think his design was secretly to revive the heresy of Arius or Sabellius under a new cover, and their zeal for the divinity of Christ made them, in the Council of Ephesus, Anno 431, condemn his opinion as heretical, and, in opposition to him, they fell into the contrary extreme of an immoderate magnifying of her; though, as I shall presently shew, they still continued within much better bounds than you do now, it being almost three hundred years after this, before ever the invocation of her or the saints was publicly established in the Church. And this brings me to my next proposal, which was, secondly:

SECOND PERIOD.

To consider what grounds the Superstition had in the Fourth Century.

92. And here, first, to what I said concerning the first beginnings of this invocation, *viz.* that the most part of your allegations from this age were rather rhetorical flights than formal prayers, you return very pleasantly:

Reply.] "That the rhetoric lies wholly at my door, who fly to so poor a shift; that these passages are some of the *duriores loci*, more difficult places, which some only nibbled at, others could not digest; and I shift off under the notion of rhetorical flights or novelties."

93. *Answ.*] One would think, by this droll, you had been lately reading the judgment of your University of Douay concerning Bertram. "Although," say they, "we do not much value that book, yet, since he has been often printed,

and is read by many, and that, in other ancient Catholics, we tolerate many errors, and extenuate or excuse them, oftentimes find out some contrivance or other to deny them, or to set a convenient gloss upon them when they are opposed to us in disputes, or in engaging with our adversaries, we do not see why we should not allow the same equity to Bertram."

94. But what now is this shifting? Why, I said that which all the learned men in the world must allow to be true, *viz.* that the Fathers of the fourth age were many of them great orators, and made use of rhetorical addresses to the saints; and that, from those conditions they sometimes expressly put into their writings, εἰ τις αἰσθῆσις, &c. "If thou hast any sense, if thou hast any concern for what is done here below," and the like, we may reasonably conclude that this was all they meant, even where they do not express any such thing.

95. But did not those Fathers do somewhat more than this? Can all their expressions be fairly reduced to such apostrophes? To this I have already said, that we do acknowledge that, about the latter end of this century, St. Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, Gregory Nyssen, amongst the Greeks, and their great imitator, St. Ambrose, among the Latins, did begin to invoke the saints; and had you thought fit to consult that excellent treatise to which I referred you,* or rather, to take notice of what was said there (for I am apt to believe you did consult it), I should not have been troubled with these impertinences here. And therefore, though it were not difficult to find some considerable faults with those few passages you have alleged from those holy men (as when you say that St. Basil exhorts those who are in tribulation to fly to the saints, those who are in joy to have recourse to them, whereas he only historically relates what they did do: "He," says he, "who is afflicted flies to them, he who is in joy runs to them"), yet I shall quit all to you, and, without either shifting or nibbling, leave you to make the most you can of them.

96. But then that you may not put any more such crude notes upon your reader as you have done here, where you say, "that Protestants grant praying to saints to have been established in the fourth age:" I will very briefly transcribe from two learned men of our Church, some considerable differences between what the Fathers of this century did, and what you

* Discourse of the Worship of Saints, in Answer to Monsieur de Meaux's Appeal to the fourth Age.

do now ; and of which if you will not yet be persuaded to take any notice, I hope at least all indifferent persons will see by them, how impertinently you allege their authority for your excuse.

First, That in your Church,* prayer to saints is looked upon as a part of worship that is due to them ; insomuch that (as I have shewn) Cardinal Bellarmine places it among one of those advantages that accrues to them upon their canonization : but this those holy Fathers never believed ; on the contrary, they absolutely define prayer, as a service proper to God only, and argued against the Arians upon this very topic, that Christ must needs be God, because the Church prayed to him.

If you pretend that there are two sorts of prayers, one proper to God, another that is not ; I reply, first, that this is false, because (as we have seen) all prayer is a religious worship, and therefore proper to God only. Secondly, It concludes nothing ; because you offer the most proper sort of prayer for help and assistance to the saints, that you can do to God himself.

Secondly, In your Church you allow mental prayer as well as vocal to be made to the saints : but in the Primitive,† this was reserved as peculiar to him who searcheth the heart, and alone knoweth the secrets of all the children of men.

Thirdly, In your Church,‡ it is resolved that the saints are capable of hearing and knowing your requests : in the Primitive this was never determined, and the contrary seems to have been the most generally received.

Fourthly, In your Church§ formal prayers are made to the saints ; but the addresses of these holy Fathers were either wishes only, or requests with the same nature with those which are in this kind usually made to the living ; where they who are requested, be evermore accounted in the number of those that pray for us, but none of those that are prayed unto by us.

Fifthly, In your Church|| the saints are made not only joint petitioners with us, but advocates too ; and that to plead not only Christ's merits, but their own likewise. But against this these Fathers openly protested as an open derogation to the high prerogative of our Saviour's meritorious intercession, and a manifest encroachment upon his great office of mediation.

* Usher's Answer to a Challenge, p. 409.

† P. 401.

‡ P. Ibid. &c.

§ P. 405.

|| P. 408.

Sixthly, In your Church* it is thought a more proper way of access, and a surer means of obtaining your requests, to address by some saint to God, than to go immediately to the throne of grace, through our Saviour Christ. But this those Fathers earnestly opposed, exhorting all men to go directly to God by his Son Jesus Christ.

Seventhly, In your Church† the saints are indifferently called upon all the world over; which does in effect attribute a divine perfection, *viz.* that of omnipresence, to them: but in the Primitive Church, those who sought the intercession of the saints, limited their presence to some determinate places, as particularly to their memories, where they thought them within hearing; and did not call upon them indifferently every where.

Eighthly, This in your Church is an established practice; they who oppose it are declared to do wickedly, and an anathema is pronounced against them on that account. But in the Primitive there was no rule or order for it; it was the effect of a private and voluntary zeal, encouraged it may be by the guides of the Church, but no part of the established service of it.

97. And this may suffice to shew how vain your pretences to the antiquity even of this age are to warrant your superstition; and upon what slender grounds you affirm, after your master the Bishop of Meaux, that this invocation of saints was established, nay, that we grant it was established in the fourth age. But to convince you yet more with what little reason you either boast of this, or tax us with receding from our old principle of being tried by the Fathers of the first four General Councils; upon this account I will now make you a more liberal offer; and that is, to prove if you can any authentic establishment of this service in the Church. I do not say now in the sixth century; but in the seventh; nay, or even before the latter end of the eighth; in short, I do affirm that the first solemn establishment of it was in the second Council of Nice, 787, and indeed that Synod which decreed the worship of images in opposition to the second commandment, was the most proper to define the religious invocation of saints contrary to the first: and because there is something almost as bad in

* P. 410, 416.

† Discourse in Answer to Monsieur de Meaux's Appeal to the fourth Age, p. 82, &c.

the manner of the establishment, as in the thing itself, I will close all with a brief account of it.

98. About the end of the sixth century, both the worship of images, and the invocation of saints, having taken deep root in the minds of many superstitious persons; controversies began to arise about them; and generally the same persons were found to be either friends or enemies to both.

In the year 754,* Constantine Copronymus called a Synod of 338 bishops, to examine into these matters, and both the invocation of saints and worship of images were utterly condemned by them.

99. Thirty years after this Council,† the abettors of these superstitions prevailing, another anti-synod was convened by the authority of the Empress Irene at Nice. In this the Acts of the former Council of Constantinople‡ were recited, and instead of the canons which they made in condemnation of this worship, two others were read in their names, establishing of it.§ How this came to pass it is not known; but this the Nicene Fathers|| themselves acknowledge, that the other Synod had established the quite contrary: nay, they were such enemies to this invocation, that Binius tells us, they exacted a solemn oath¶ of all their party, that they would never invoke the saints, apostles, martyrs, or the blessed Virgin. And yet have these good Fathers transmitted down to posterity those two spurious canons of the Council of Constantinople, as approving that very worship, which the Council in the true definitions of it had utterly disclaimed.

100. As for the Synod of Nice itself; if the definitions there made were of any force, that of Frankfort, seven years after, has utterly taken it away; in which "it was so wholly abrogated and annulled, as not to be placed in the number of Synods, or be any otherwise esteemed of than that of Ariminum."** And I should be glad you would find me any other (but pretended) establishment of it, before your Synod of Trent in the very last age.

I have only now remaining in the last place to shew:

* Baron. ad Ann. 754. [p. 22.] [vol. 12. p. 600. Luc. 1742.] N. 38. Spondan. Ibid. n. 6. [p. 673. col. 1. Mogunt. 1618.]

† Binius in Syn. Const. p. 1663. T. vi. Concil. Labbe. [1671.]

‡ Action. vi. [Ibid. vol. 7. p. 398, &c.]

§ Defin. xv. xvii.

|| Annot. Epiphan. in Def. xvii.

¶ Binius Annot. in Concil. Const. T. vi. [Ibid.] p. 1663. Baron. l. c.

** Act. Concil. Franc. in lib. Carol. præf. in l. 1. [n. 12. 1549.]

SECT. IV.

What our Reasons are against this Service.

101. You had asked me in your Vindication, "what authority have you to oppose us? You say that (to invoke saints) is repugnant to God's word: shew that word; if you cannot, we are in possession, and the antiquity and uninterruptedness of our doctrine, besides the reasonableness and innocency of it, confirms us in our belief."*

102. To this I answered, "that every text of Scripture that appropriated divine worship to God alone, was a demonstration against you: and that that one passage of St. Paul, Rom. x. 14, How shall they call upon him in whom they have not believed? were men not willing to be contentious, might end the controversy. And for the authority you speak of, that it was ridiculous to pretend prescription for that, which has not the least foundation neither in holy writ nor in primitive Christianity; of which not one instance appears for the first three hundred years after Christ, and much to the contrary."†

103. To this you now reply in your margin‡ with great assurance: "Protestants destitute of Scripture proofs against the doctrine of invocation of saints:" but all you have to say in the book is, "that you do not give divine worship to the saints, nor call upon them in that strict sense in which they are duties only to be paid to God." That is to say, you play with words, and make use of such distinctions as, if they were allowed, a man might evacuate any other of God's commands, without a possibility of being confuted. And I desire you to tell me what answer you would make an impudent woman, that should give her husband's bed to another, and being charged by you for breaking the seventh commandment, should tell you that you were not to be so uncharitable as to judge of what she did by the external act, that the law forbade only lying with another man, as with her husband; and that in this strict sense she was still innocent, by reserving that highest degree of conjugal affection to him only, the giving whereof to another would make her guilty.

* Vindic. p. 30.

† Def. p. 9.

‡ Reply, p. 21. § 16.

104. But since you are so desirous to know what our reasons against this invocation are, I will now very freely lay them before you, if you will first give me leave only to prepare the way for them, by stating truly the difference between us in this matter, which you are wonderfully apt either to mistake or to palliate.

105. You tell us in your Vindication,* “that all you say, is, that it is lawful to pray to the saints;” and so again in your Reply.† The difference (you say) between us is, “whether it be lawful for us to beseech or entreat them to pray for us?” Monsieur de Meaux in the same moderate way tells us, “that the Church teaches that it is profitable to pray to the saints:” and the Representer (from the Council of Trent) says of a true Papist, “that his Church teaches him (and he believes) that it is good and profitable, to desire the intercession of the saints, reigning with Christ in heaven.” In your discourses with those of our communion, there is nothing more ordinary with you, than to make them believe you value not praying to the saints, nor condemn any for not doing it. That if this be all they scruple in your religion, they shall be received freely by you, and never pray to a saint as long as they live. Nay, I have heard of some who have gone so far in this matter, as to venture their religion upon it, and that you do not necessarily require the practice or profession of this service at all; nor pronounce any anathema against us for opposing of it.

106. But this is not ingenuous; nor as becomes the disciples of Christ. For tell me now, I beseech you: if we unite ourselves to your Church, will you not oblige us to go to mass with you? Or can you dare for our sakes to alter your service, and leave out all those things that relate to the blessed Virgin and to the saints in it? Shall we be excused from having any thing to do with your Litanies and processions, your vespers or your salves? Or will you purge all these too in order to our conversion? When we lie in our last agonies, will you be content to anoint us in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; and leave the angels, archangels, patriarchs, prophets, and apostles, martyrs, confessors, virgins, and all the saints, out of the commission? And when our souls are now expiring, shall we be sure you will not then at least trouble us with that long bead-roll which your office prescribes to be called upon in that ceremony? If you have

* Vindic. p. 30.

† Reply, p. 11. Expos. Sect. 4. p. 5. Papist Repr. N. 2. p. 2.

indeed the liberty to do this, why do you not use it, and remove so great a stumbling-block as this out of our way? But if you cannot dispense with these things for our common conversion, how shall we believe that you can do it to satisfy a private proselyte?

107. The truth is, invocation of saints in your Church is not esteemed so indifferent a matter as you would have it thought to be. It is a worship you suppose due to them, and to which they acquire a right by their canonization. So Cardinal Bellarmine informs us: and therefore in your profession of faith set forth by the order of Pope Pius IV. you are obliged with "a firm faith to believe and profess, that the saints, who reign together with Christ, are to be venerated and invoked." And though the alarm which the Council of Trent was in upon the news of the Pope's sickness, and the haste which thereupon they made to conclude that Synod, permitted them not to frame any canons in this last, as they had done in the other sessions; yet the materials put together in that chapter, shew us what anathemas would have been thundered against us. For to take it only as it lies in that session.* There we find "the bishop and pastors of the Church commanded to teach (what therefore I hope is undoubtedly the Church's sense in this point), that the saints who reign together with Christ, offer up their prayers to God for men: that it is good and profitable in a suppliant manner to call upon them: and that for the obtaining benefits of God by his Son Jesus Christ our Lord, who is our only Saviour and Redeemer, we should fly to their prayers, aid, and assistance. They declare that those who deny (which you know we all do) that the saints who enjoy eternal happiness in heaven, are to be invoked, or say that this invocation is idolatry (as we generally believe it to be) or that it is contrary to the word of God; or derogatory to the honour of the one Mediator between God and man, Christ Jesus; or that it is foolish to supplicate those who reign in heaven, in word or in mind; do think *wickedly*."

108. These are the words of your Council. If therefore you permit your proselytes to profess what they do not believe; if you receive those as good Catholics into your Church, whom nevertheless you know to remain still infected with wicked opinions, contrary to the doctrine and practice estab-

* Concil. Trid. Sess. 25. [Labbe, Concil. vol. 14. p. 895. 1672.]



lished amongst you ; if you allow them to assist at your prayers, without any intention to join in them, nay, in an opinion that they could not pray with you, without committing a grievous sin ; then go on to make fools believe as you do, that you oblige nobody to pray to the saints, and that they may be of your Church, and yet still believe or do what they please in this matter. But if otherwise this be all gross hypocrisy, if there be nothing but cheat and design in these pretences ; then may I humbly desire all sincere members of our communion, to beware of such guides, as value not how they charge ours, or palliate their own religion, so they may but by any means draw unwary men into their net.

109. But the Council of Trent goes yet further : it does not only establish this doctrine, but in express terms anathematizes those who oppose it : for in the close of that chapter* I but now mentioned, thus it decrees : “ if any one shall teach or *think* contrary to these decrees ; let him be *anathema*.” All which your epitomator Caranza thus delivers in short, “ The Synod† commands (all those who have the care of souls) that they should teach the invocation of saints ; the honour of relics ; and the use of images ; and that those who teach otherwise, do think *wickedly*. And if any one shall teach or think contrary to these decrees, let him be *anathema*.”

110. It remains therefore that your Church does teach and require all its members both the profession and practice of such an invocation, as I have before explained : and of which I now undertake to shew :

1. That it is repugnant to God’s holy word.
2. Contrary to antiquity.
3. That it is unreasonable in the constitution ; and,
4. Unprofitable and unlawful in the practice.

I. It is repugnant to God’s holy word.

111. And here, first, I will not doubt once more to tell you, that to pray to saints after the manner that it is now done in the Church of Rome, is contrary to all those passages of holy Scripture which attribute religious worship to God only ; such as Deut. vi. 13, “ Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God, and serve him, and swear by his name ;” and again, chap. x. 12, 20. xiii. 4, &c. All which our Saviour Christ has taught us to interpret with such a restrictive term, as excludes all others from

* Concil. Trid. Ibid.

† Caranza Summ. Sess. 25. Conc. Trid. p. 482. Lovanii, 1681.

a share in our service. Matth. iv. 10, "It is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve." I have already shewn that all prayer made to a person that is absent, with a confidence that he is able both to know our wants, and to hear our prayers, and to answer our desires, is in its own nature a religious worship. Now then from these places of holy Scripture, I thus argue: it is repugnant to God's word to give any proper acts of religious worship to any but God only: but all such prayer as is made in your Church to the saints departed, are proper acts of religious worship; and therefore it must be contrary to God's word to pray to any but God only.

112. Nor am I here at all concerned in your distinctions of a supreme, and an inferior religious honour; seeing both you and I are agreed that all honour properly religious (such as prayer) is comprised under these prohibitions. If I were, I would then tell you that the devil here did not require of Christ such a supreme worship, but, on the contrary, acknowledged himself to have a superior, from whom he derived his power of disposing of all the kingdoms of the earth, and the glories of them. All he desired was, to have some religious honour paid to him. And our Saviour by alleging this sentence of the law against it, evidently shews that it is not only such a supreme religious worship as some of you pretend, but that all such honour in general, is the peculiar service of God alone. But this (if you stand to your own principles) you cannot object, and for others, what I have now said may suffice to obviate their pretences.

113. Secondly, What I have now concluded from this general principle of holy Scripture, I will in the next place more particularly enforce from these other passages, where the worship of creatures is expressly prohibited. In the tenth of the Acts, when Cornelius fell down at St. Peter's feet, and would have worshipped him, "he took him up, saying, I myself also am a man."* It is a poor shift here to say, that Cornelius would have worshipped St. Peter with a supreme divine worship; he was not certainly so ignorant as to think, that when the angel bid him send to Joppa for Simon Peter, who lodged with Simon, a tanner, he meant he would send for the great God that had made heaven and earth. Nor is it of any more moment which others amongst you suggest, *viz.* that Cornelius did well to adore him, but that St. Peter out

* Acts x. 25.

of modesty refused it. And the answer he gave, "I myself also am a man," utterly overthrows all such insinuations; being as much as if he had said, that no man whatsoever was to be worshipped.

114. But this will more evidently appear in another instance, viz. that of St. John, Rev. xix. 10,* who, when in his ecstasy he fell down and would have worshipped the angel that discoursed with him, the blessed spirit utterly forbade him; "See (says he) thou do it not, for I am thy fellow-servant: *worship God.*" In which words are plainly established these two conclusions against this service: 1st, That angels (and so likewise the saints) being our fellow-servants, are not to be worshipped; 2dly, That God only is to be adored.

115. But St. Paul is yet more plain: he exhorts the Colossians in general, and in them us: Colos. ii. 18,† "Let no man beguile you of your reward in a voluntary humility, and worshipping of angels." It is answered by some among you, that this was said in opposition to the heresy of Simon Magus, who would have sacrifice offered to the angels, or at least of some others, who thought that though Christ had abolished the law, yet was it still to be observed out of respect to the angels by whom it had been delivered. But besides that I do not find any such thing charged by any of the ancients upon Simon Magus, as is pretended; had St. Paul designed only to forbid one particular act of religious worship being paid to them, would he in general have said that they were not to be worshipped? Or had he intended to signify the abolishing of the law, would he not have said so here, as well as in his other Epistles? and not have given such an obscure insinuation of it, as when he meant to forewarn them against observing the law, to bid them have a care of worshipping angels. But the truth is, the meaning of the text is too plain to be thus eluded. And I shall give it to you in the words of an ancient Father, who lived in those very times in which you yet pretend such a service was established: "Those who maintained an observance of the law together with the Gospel, taught also that angels were to be worshipped; saying, that the law was given by them. This custom remained a long time in Phrygia and Pisidia. Upon which account the Synod of Laodicea in Phrygia, forbade them by a law to *pray to angels.*"‡ But,

* Rev. xix. 10. xxii. 8.

† Colos. ii. 18.

‡ Theodoret. in loc. [vol. 3, p. 490. Hal. 1771.]

116. Thirdly, And to come more immediately to the worship of invocation. The same Apostle in that question,* Rom. x. 14, "How shall they call upon Him in whom they have not believed?" furnishes us with another maxim of holy Scripture against all such prayers; *viz.* that no one is to be invoked in our religious addresses, but he only in whom we believe. But now reason, Scripture, the common Creeds of all Christians shew that we are to believe *only* in God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and therefore upon him *only* must we call. As for your distinction that this indeed in one sense is very true, but then in another and secondary† sense others besides God may be both believed in, and called upon; if you mean in a civil respect, it is indeed very true, but nothing to your purpose, seeing in this sense we can no more believe in, than we can call upon such persons as are absent from us, and know nothing at all of us, which is the case of the saints departed. But for believing in a religious sense, as it is properly an act of divine faith, and the foundation of that assurance with which we call upon God by our Saviour Jesus Christ; this admits of no distinction, nor may it by any means, or in any measure be applied, without sin, to any other than God alone.

117. I will add but one principle more of holy Scripture against this service, and so close this first point. Rom. xiv. 23, "That whatsoever is not of faith is sin."‡ But now those prayers which have no foundation in holy Scripture, cannot be of faith; for (says the same Apostle, Rom. x. 17.) "faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God:" and therefore such prayers must be sin. If God has any where revealed it to you, that you may lawfully give such a religious worship to the saints, shew this, and our dispute is ended. But if you cannot do this, nor by consequence cannot pray to them with any well grounded persuasions of conscience that this is what God allows, and what the saints are capable of receiving, I do not see how it can be avoided but that to you it must be sin so to do. Εἰ γὰρ πᾶν ὃ οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως ἁμαρτία ἐστίν, ὥς φησιν ὁ ἀπόστολος, ἡ δὲ πίστις ἐξ ἀκοῆς, ἡ δὲ ἀκοὴ ῥήματος Θεοῦ· Πᾶν τὸ ἐκτὸς τῆς Θεοπνεύστου γραφῆς, οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως ὄν, ἁμαρτία ἐστίν.§ As an ancient Father argues from this very principle in the like manner.

118. For the other part of this service, the intercession of

* Rom. x. 14.

† Reply, p. 21.

‡ Rom. xiv. 23.

§ S. Basil. Reg. Moral. 80. [vol. 2. p. 444. Par. 1839.]

the saints for us: I might to this oppose all those passages of the New Testament, where Christ is set forth to us as our only Mediator. But I shall content myself with one single text,* 1 Tim. ii. 5, 6: "There is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for all." Now if there be but one Mediator, then saints and angels are not mediators, as you pretend. If the foundation of Christ's mediatorship be this, "that he gave himself a ransom for all;" then seeing the saints have not done this, it must follow that neither can they be our mediators. And this cuts off your new distinction of a mediator of intercession, and a mediator of redemption; which besides that it is the issue of your own brains, and was invented only to support a tottering cause, is here utterly destroyed; seeing the foundation of Christ's mediating now in heaven, and appearing in the presence of God for us, is by virtue of his being our Mediator of redemption upon earth; and he therefore is become our Intercessor there, because he shed his blood for our expiation here. This is that great argument upon which the author to the Hebrews so much insists, chap. ix. x. And the analogy of the high-priest under the law, making first the expiatory sacrifice for the people, and then entering into the holiest to appear before God for them, most evidently confirms it to us. And this may suffice for the first point, that this service is contrary to the principles of holy Scripture.

II. It is contrary to antiquity.

119. And here I am fallen into a vast ocean; and should never have ended, should I go about particularly to shew how vain your pretences are to possession for this superstition. It shall suffice me at present only to point out to you a few of those remarks which others have more largely pursued; and which do abundantly declare how little conformable the best and highest antiquity has been to what you now practise.

120. I have already given some short account of the first three centuries: and how little able you are to lay any claim to the authority of them. You have here seen what the opinion was of those holy Fathers touching the state of the saints departed: how they thought that they do not yet enjoy the beatific vision, and by consequence were not in a condition to be called upon by the Church on earth. I have shewn you the Fathers arguing against the Arians for the divinity of

* 1 Tim. ii. 5, 6.

Christ from the Church's praying to him ; and which evidently proves that they thought that none but God was capable of such a service. I have offered you the definitions which those holy men gave of prayer ; *viz.* that it was an address to God, a conversing with God, and the like ; and in all which they still restrained it to him as his own peculiar prerogative. There we find no mention of any calling upon the blessed Virgin or the saints. No distinction of supreme and inferior religious worship ; of mediators of redemption and intercession : in short, none of those evasions with which all your discourses on this point are now filled ; and without which, indeed, according to your principles, it is impossible to explain it.

121. But I will now add yet more. It was a general custom in the third and following ages (concerning which we are particularly to inquire) to pray for the saints departed, for martyrs and confessors, nay, for the blessed Virgin herself,* as has been elsewhere fully proved, and I suppose you will not have the confidence to deny it. Now let me appeal to any reasonable man to say ; could the Church in those times have prayed in a suppliant manner to the saints, as reigning with God, nay, and gods themselves by participation, to aid and assist them, when on the contrary they thought them in such a state as to need prayers to God for them ? Is it to be believed, that they addressed to those as mediators and intercessors with God, for whom they themselves interceded to God ? It is a memorable remark that has been made to confirm the force of this argument, that since the prevalency of this praying to saints in the Church of Rome, your public rituals have had a notable change. Those very saints which in your ancient Missals you prayed for, being now *a la mode* prayed to. Thus upon IV. Kalends of July, in the Sacramentary of Pope Gregory I.† above six hundred years after Christ, we find this prayer made in behalf of St. Leo, one of your Popes.

“ Grant, O Lord, that this oblation may be profitable to the soul of thy servant Leo.”

But in the present Roman Missal,‡ the collect is changed, and the address made by the intercession of the saint now, that was formerly made by way of intercession for him.

“ Grant to us, O Lord, that by the intercession of blessed Leo, this offering may be profitable to *us*.”

* Discourse of Purgatory and Prayers for the Dead.

† Sacrament. Greg. p. 112.

‡ Missale Rom. p. 612.

And of this change, Pope Innocent III.* gives this honest account: *viz.* That the authority of holy Scripture says, that he injures a martyr that prays for a martyr (wherein yet his infallibility misled him, it being St. Augustine, and not the Scripture that said so); "and they do not want our prayers, but we theirs." Which the Gloss thus more fully expresses: "It was changed (*viz.* this prayer for Pope Leo) because anciently they prayed *for* him, but now *to* him." And from whence therefore we may warrantably infer, that in those first ages praying *to* saints was not established, seeing it was then the general custom to pray *for* them.

122. The truth is, the whole face of the ancient Church seems clearly opposite to the present practice: some doubted whether the holy saints departed do at all concern themselves for us, or conduce anything to our salvation. So Origen. And these to be sure never prayed to them. Others made open opposition to such service. So the Council of Laodicea, St. Epiphanius, Vigilantius, and others before mentioned. Now you canonize saints, and esteem it necessary so to do, to prevent men's praying to those in heaven, who are it may be at this time tormenting in hell. But in those first ages we find none of these apotheoses; and Bellarmine† himself could not find out any instance of any saint that was canonized before the eighth century. If we go into your churches, we find them filled with altars and chapels, images and relics of the saints; candles are lighted up before them; incense is burned to their honour: but in those primitive ages, not the least shadow is to be met with of any such superstitions. Your books of devotion are now filled with little else than advices how to pray to the blessed Virgin; to list yourselves into her service; to vow yourselves to her worship; her Psalter, and Rosary, and salutation is in every part of your performances. Even the Catechism of the Council of Trent itself, the most cautious book that has been set forth for some ages in your Church, having taught you first how to pray to God, fails not to instruct you that you must in the next place have recourse to the saints, and make prayers to them.

How comes it to pass, if this were the primitive practice too, that none of those holy Fathers, in any of their practical discourses, have ever treated of these things? Nay, on the contrary,

* Decret. lib. 3. tit. 41. [vol. 2.] p. 1372, 1373. [Lugd. 1671.]

† De Beatit. SS. lib. 1. c. 8. [vol. 2. p. 398. col. 1. Prag. 1721.]

they everywhere thunder in our ears, that Protestant, heretical maxim, that we must pray to *God only*, and that we ought not to address ourselves to any other.

123. In all your sermons you call upon the blessed Virgin for assistance. In the ends of your books, her name seldom fails of standing in the same return of praise in which God and our Saviour are glorified. Your public service and private prayers are all overrun with this superstition. But is there any thing of this in the primitive Rituals? Look, I beseech you, into the account that has been given us of the public service of the ancient Church by Justin Martyr, Tertullian, nay, by the Clementine Constitutions themselves: consult the relation which Pliny made to the Emperor Trajan of their manners. Try those famous Liturgies of the Church* within the first hundred years, which nobody has the happiness to be acquainted with but yourself; see if you can pick us up but one instance, but some shadow of an instance, to flourish with on this occasion.

124. What are the lives of your saints, but continued histories of their devotion to the blessed Virgin and the saints, and the favours which upon that account they received from them? But in the ancient compilers of such kinds of discourses, we find only dry accounts of their piety towards God, of their zeal and constancy in the faith, of their patience in suffering anything, rather than submit to such superstitious practices as these, which the heathens indeed would have drawn them to, but which the Church utterly abhorred. But for their knight-errantry in honour of the blessed Virgin; for watching whole nights before her images, or in her chapels; for turning vagabonds in order to the visiting her chamber in Loretto; or fetching a feather from Compostella; of this new method of piety, there are not the least traces.

125. I might run out these remarks into almost infinite examples, were they not things as well known, as your contrary superstition is notorious. But I shall reserve these, and some other observations of the like kind, till you think fit to call me to account for them. In the mean time, I conclude from this short specimen I have here given, that certainly the face of the Church must be very much changed as to these things; or otherwise that so great a difference could not possibly be found in the lives, the writings, the actions, the cus-

* Reply, p. 19.

toms, the opinions, the expressions, prayers, practices of those holy Fathers, from what we see and lament in your Church at this day. I go on, thirdly, to shew,

III. The unreasonableness of this service.

126. And for that I shall offer only this one plain argument; if the saints cannot ordinarily hear your prayers, nor are able to attend distinctly to those addresses that are made to them: if those whom you canonize are not indeed such as you suppose, but many at this day tormented in hell, upon whom you call for assistance in heaven: if some of those to whom you pray never had any being, but either in the Herald's Office, or in the fruitful womb of a legendary's brain: then it cannot be doubted but that to pray to the saints must be the most unreasonable devotion in the world; you speak to the wind, and call upon them to as little purpose as if you should here in England make an address to a man in China or Tartary; and you might as well have continued the deities, as you do the practice of the ancient heathens in this service: it being altogether as wise a devotion to pray to a Jupiter or an Apollo that never lived in the world, as to a St. George or a St. Christopher that never had any more being in it than they. And yet were you now to inquire into these circumstances, without a full knowledge of which this invocation can never be a reasonable service, what uncertain accounts should we receive from you. For,

127. First, As to the main foundation of all, "whether the saints hear your prayers?"* In what doubt is your Bishop of Meaux still in his Exposition?† and you know he was once in a great deal more. All he has to say is, that you teach, "that your prayers to the saints are very profitable, whether it be that they know them by the ministry and communication of the angels; or whether it be that God himself makes known to them our desires by a particular revelation; or whether it be that he discovers the secret to them in his divine essence, in which all truth is comprised."‡ If we inquire of your ancient authors, we shall find all full of uncertainty. Lombard§ thought it was not incredible to suppose, that the saints might know the prayers that were addressed to them. Scotus§ went a little farther, and judged it to be probable that

* In his suppressed Edition.

† Expos. of M. de Meaux, Sect. 4. p. 7.

‡ Lombard. Sent. lib. 4. dist. 45. [fol. 432. p. 1. Colon. Agr. 1566.]

§ Scotus. *ibid.* qu. 4. [fol. clxxxiii. p. 1. col. 2. Par. 1513.]

God revealed these things to them: and so did Gabriel Biel.* Those who pretend to more certainty, yet are able to give but very little reason why; unless you will take this for a reason, that their Church generally believes so, and that otherwise it would be vain and absurd to pray to them.† In short, how the saints hear your prayers you do not pretend to know; and I desire you to give me but one rational argument to convince me that (by whatever means it is) they do ordinarily, and constantly, and certainly, and particularly understand the addresses that you make to them. For to deal freely with you, I never yet met with any thing that but inclined me to believe this, but much to the contrary.

128. Secondly, Concerning the canonization of your saints, may I beg leave to ask you: are you sure that all those whom your Church has placed in heaven, are truly there? If you are not, I am sure you do very unreasonably to pray to them. Now this I the rather desire to be satisfied in, because here again I find your authors very much unresolved what to say.

First, It is but the common opinion‡ (no matter of faith), that the power of canonizing saints belongs to the Pope; and therefore it cannot be, without all doubt, whether those whom he canonizes, are infallibly saints or no.

Secondly, The Jesuit Vasquez§ tells us, there are Catholics, (he means those of your communion) who do not think it without doubt that all whom your Church has canonized are indeed saints: and he mentions no less a man than Cardinal Cajetan|| for one. And that Cardinal in the book to which Vasquez refers, alleges the great doctor of your schools, St. Thomas, for another. To these I will add Melchior Canus, Antoninus, and Gerson,¶ who at most esteem it but piously credible, not absolutely certain. But Augustinus Triumphus goes farther; and doubts not freely to declare, that all who are canonized by the Pope cannot be in heaven. And Prateolus tells us that Herman, the author of the heresy of the Fraticelli, was for twenty years together after his death honoured as a saint, and then his body was taken up and burnt for a heretic. And now if

* Gabr. Biel. in Can. Miss. l. 31. [fol. xlviii. p. 2. col. 2. Lugd. 1511.]

† Bellarm. de Eccles. Triumph. l. 1. cap. 20.

‡ Bellarm. l. 1. de Beat. SS. c. 8, 9. [p. 398. vol. ii. Prag. 1721.]

§ Vasquez. l. 1. de Ador. disp. 5. c. 3.

|| Cajetan. libr. de Indulg. c. 8. Canus loc. Theol. lib. 5. c. 5. [p. 274. Colon. Agr. 1605.]

¶ Gerson de 4. dom. cons. 2, &c. de Exam. doct. cons. 1. See Bishop Taylor's Polem. disc. p. 333.

you are not yet sensible of the danger you run by this means, whilst you not only call upon a damned soul for aid and assistance, but (as in some of your prayers you do) pray unto God so to give you grace on earth, as he has glorified them in heaven; I shall leave it to your own Cardinal Bellarmine to inform you of it.*

Thirdly, It is confessed by those of your own Church, that among your canonized saints, some there have been whose lives were not to be commended: others whose opinions have been condemned as heretical; and for my part, when I consider the character of some to whom you pray, such as Thomas à Becket, Dominick, &c. I cannot but say, that if these be the men whom you place in heaven, what the poor Indians did of the Spaniards, that then the other is certainly the more desirable portion. For I am persuaded that were but St. Martin again alive to summon their souls before him, as he once did that of a supposed saint in his time, they would make the same confession which that wretched spirit is reported to have done,† and prove much more worthy your compassion than your adoration. Now that which the more increases this danger, is,

Fourthly, The almost infinite number of saints that have been received amongst you, and whose consecration depending wholly on matter of fact, in which you do not pretend the Pope to be infallible, it can hardly be supposed but that he must have very often proved mistaken. For to keep only to your own order; a late author of yours tells us, that your domestic saints‡ alone did long since by computation amount to forty-four thousand. And I find another list increasing them to fifty thousand.§ Now to consider all the arts and intrigues that are used to procure these canonizations; by what Popes many of them have been placed in heaven; what characters several among them have in your own histories of their lives; these and many other reflections would I confess prompt me, were I otherwise as well satisfied of the innocence of this worship, as I am fully convinced of the unlawfulness of it, yet to pray to the greatest part of your saints, as he once did to St. Cuthbert, *Si sanctus sis, ora pro me: "If thou art a saint, pray for me."*

* De SS. Beat. l. 1. c. 9. Sect. secundo.

† Vid. Bellar. de Beat. SS. l. 1. c. 7.

‡ Calendarium Benedictinum ad 26. Dec.

§ Dr. Jackson, T. 1. p. 937.

129. It is I know, the last refuge of many, who consider this uncertainty to say, that at least your good intention shall render these prayers acceptable to God ;* for what (says the learned Erasmus), if the saints do not perceive our desires, yet Christ does know them, and will for them give us what we ask. But yet still this will not make it a reasonable service ; nor can you with a firm faith call upon those in heaven, of whom you have at most but a pious credulity that they are there ; and though some of your authors do believe, that your own piety shall excuse you, yet others utterly deny it, and doubt not to say that you may as well excuse the heathens themselves,† who in worshipping the parts of the world, supposed (according to Varro's divinity) that they worshipped the Divine Nature that was diffused through it. But,

130. Thirdly, That which is the worst of all, is, that you have not only no certainty of the happiness of those saints whom you canonize, but you pray to some who (for aught appears) never had any being in the world.

Now among these, I shall not doubt, in the first place, to account our own country saint and champion St. George, and of whom our English legends still recount so many miracles ; though Cardinal Baronius himself has confessed, that they are for the most part absolutely false.‡ In the Roman Breviary, since the reformation of it by Pope Pius V. there is no account at all of his life ; and your own author tells us the reason is, because there is no certain truth of any of those things that are extant concerning him.§ And indeed, if the ancient histories of this saint were justly censured by Pope Gelasius as apocryphal, we have no reason to believe that the latter legends deserve any better reception. As for the famous story which still continues in those equally books of the ignorant, the English Lives of the Saints, and the Sign Posts ; where we see this great champion, like another Perseus, mounted to deliver the fair Andromeda from the dragon's mouth ; Baronius charges Jacobus a Voragine with the pure invention of it, and almost every body now, but our English compiler, is grown ashamed of it. In short, if there be any foundation at all in antiquity for this story, it is but little for the satisfaction of those who worship this saint. Your own

* Vossius *Theol. Theol.* p. 106.

† Catharinus *Annot. in Cajet. dogm. de canoniz.* p. 135. [*Par.* 1535.]

‡ Baron. in *Martyr. R.* Apr. 23. [p. 155. *Par.* 1607.]

§ Ribadencira. ad 23. April.

authors confess that this George lived about the time of Diocletian, that he was by birth a Cappadocian; that he had encounters with Athanasius, a magician: now all this seems to persuade us, that our St. George was no other than George, the Arian bishop, who was also a Cappadocian by birth, who had encounters with St. Athanasius, whom the Arians called a magician; and who was deified by those heretics after his violent death in the time of Julian. And in memory of which perhaps it was, that they first mounted him upon a camel (he being led through the streets upon one), and then for greater decency changed it into a horse; to which Jacobus a Voragine added the dragon and the lady; with the warlike equipage of casque and lance: and thus is our tutelary saint brought under suspicion of being, if any thing at all, a wicked heretic; that persecuted one of the greatest bishops of his time, for asserting the Divinity of the Son of God; and yet is this man still prayed to in your Church; and I have now by me an ancient ritual, in which he is seen armed at all points, his spear in the dragon's mouth, the lady by him on her knees; and these prayers addressed to him.

"Saint *George*, famous martyr; praise and glory become thee: by whom the princely lady, being grieved by a wicked dragon, was preserved.

"Almighty and everlasting God, who mercifully hearest the prayers of those who call upon thee; we humbly beseech thy Majesty, that as for the honour of thy blessed and glorious martyr St. George, thou causedst the dragon to be overcome by a maid, so by his intercession thou wouldest vouchsafe to defend us against all our enemies, visible and invisible, that they may not be able to hurt us, through Jesus Christ our Lord."

Now what is this but to mock God in his solemn service? To pray to him through the intercession of a man that either never lived in the world, or it may be, was one of his most hated enemies; and deified by a crew of wretched heretics, for his fury in opposing the eternal generation of the Saviour of us all.

131. And what I have thus chosen more particularly to insist upon in this example, I might shew in several others not a whit less fabulous. Our Saviour in St. Luke gives a parabolical account of the different states of men in the other world, under the names of Dives and Lazarus. As for the former, there was no great danger of making him a saint. But for Lazarus, he

is transubstantiated into a real man. Temples are built among you to his honour: anniversary solemnities* are consecrated to his memory, and because he was represented in Scripture as full of sores, he is now made the patron of the lepers in heaven. From the Greek word signifying a spear, you have first found out a name for the centurion that ran our blessed Lord into the side; and having metamorphosed the spear into a man, it was no hard matter to make the man a saint: and now upon the 15th of March,† who so much honoured as St. Longinus? Nay, what is yet more pleasant, Baronius assures us that his venerable body is kept in the church of St. Augustine at Rome.

132. St. Christopher is another of your saints that never lived. He is pretended to have suffered under Dagnus, king of Lycia, who also was never in the world; and being of a giantly stature, to have dwelt by a river side where there was no bridge, and there he made it his business in charity to carry over all that passed that way: which our Saviour so much approved as to suffer him once upon a time to carry himself over upon his shoulders. Now all this Cardinal Baronius‡ confesses to be a mere legend; but our thorough-paced English-Irish collector, though he confesses he never saw any approved author that said it, yet for the pictures' sake, which are so common amongst you, declares generously that he was resolved to believe it. And the ancient ritual I before mentioned, prays to our Saviour, that in consideration of his riding over the river upon St. Christopher's back, he would deliver you from all dangers.

133. I should never have done, should I insist on this manner upon all other imaginary saints whom you worship. Such were your own countrywoman again, St. Ursula, and her 11,000 Virgins; who is pretended to have been daughter to Dionet, king of Cornwall, in the time of Marcian, when there was no such king in England; and to have been martyred at Cologne, whither she went by ship, being the first and last that ever sailed thither; and yet this lady makes no mean figure in your Church. She is patroness under God and the blessed Virgin, of a whole religious society; and with great devotion prayed to, December 21st. I might to this visionary saintess

* Baron. Ann. ad. Ann. 3. §. 44.

† Baron. Not. in Mart. 15 March. [ut supra, p. 109.]

‡ Not. ad Martyrol. Jun. 25. [ibid. p. 245.]

add others of the same sex; St. Catharine, St. Margaret, &c. but I shall content myself with one memorable instance, not so commonly known, which may suffice to shew with what uncertainty you pray to many in these devotions. The account is given by one of your own communion, and who himself discovered the mistake.

134. About eight miles from Evora,* a city of Portugal, there is a place which they call the Cave of the Martyrs; where they pretend were slain a great number of Christians with their bishop and his two sisters; to one of which, called Columba, there was a chapel erected, and in the place where the other was slain, there issued out a spring of sweet water, called to this day, Holy Well, and very good for curing a weak sight. The sepulchre of the Bishop himself, is in a church of the blessed Virgin's, empty, and open. Over it is a table of stone, supported by four pillars, so that a man might go under it. Hither came all those that had pains in their loins, and imploring the aid of this martyr, they went away certainly cured. There was also the picture of this Bishop, and upon this stone table they sacrificed the mass, in honour to him, calling him by his proper name *Viarius*.

135. This was the ancient tradition and worship. When Ressendius, who relates this story, came hither, in order to the publishing the life of the saint, among others he was then writing; he desired the priest, who had given him this account of their martyr, to shew him if there were any ancient records or inscriptions, that confirmed it. Upon this he brought him to the altar before-mentioned, and there he found this inscription.

S.
Q. JVL. CLARO. C. V. IIII. VI
RO VIARVM CVRANDA
RVM ANN. XXI.
Q. JVL. NEPOTIANO. C. I.
III. VIRO VIARVM CVRAN
DARVM ANN. XX.
CALP. SABINA. FILIIS.

The priest, pointing with his finger to these words *Viarum Crrandarum*, see (says he) the proper name of the martyr

* Ressendii Epist. ad Barthol. Kebedium. p. 168.

Viarius : and for *Curandarum*, it is as much as to say *Cura Curarum*, i.e. a bishop. As for the other names (continued he) I suppose they may be the proper names of the other martyrs that suffered with him.

136. Ressendius held his countenance as well as ever he could, but went immediately away to Cardinal Alphonsus, who was as that time Bishop of Evora, and told him all that had passed, and how a couple of heathens, overseers of the highways, had been worshipped there for Christians and martyrs. The Cardinal commanded the tomb to be stopped up, to the great discontent of the people, who had been wont to receive mighty relief by their addresses to this Viarius; and cursed the learning and curiosity of Ressendius, that had deprived them of so great and useful a saint.

137. I shall make no other application of this story,* than what I find in the complaint of another learned man of your Church, as to this very matter. "There is also (says he) another error, not uncommon; that neglecting, in a manner, the ancient and known saints, the common people worship more ardently and diligently, the new and unknown; of whose holiness we have but little assurance, and some of which are known to us only by revelation; insomuch that of several of them it is justly doubted, whether ever there were any such persons in the world."

138. From all these considerations, I now conclude against the reasonableness of this invocation. 1. No man can reasonably pray in faith to such persons, as he can never be sure are able either to hear his prayers, or to answer his desires: but you can never be sure that your saints are able to do either of these; and therefore you cannot reasonably pray with any good assurance to them. 2. It is unreasonable to pray to those as saints, who, it may be, are not in heaven, nor ever shall be there: but this is very probably the case of many of your saints, and you cannot be sure it is otherwise, when you address to them; and therefore it is unreasonable in you to pray to them. 3. To pray to those who never were in the world, is the most unreasonable thing that can be imagined; but in your prayers to many of your saints, you address to those that never were in the world; and therefore upon this, and upon all the foregoing accounts, I conclude it very unreasonable to pray to the saints at all.

* Cassander Consult. p. 971. [p. 157. Lugd. 1608.]

There is yet one thing more remaining to finish this whole subject of invocation of saints, *viz.*

IV. That it is unprofitable, and impious in the practice.

First, That it is unprofitable.

139. And if the former consideration stand good; this will necessarily follow from it. For if either those whom you pray to, are mere figments of your own brain, that have neither truth nor existence; or if, though they do exist, yet they are not saints as you suppose; or though they should be saints too, yet have no means ordinarily and particularly to hear your prayers, nor can attend to those numberless addresses that are at the same time from all the parts of the world put up to them; it must then be a most unprofitable, as well as a most senseless practice to pray to them; and what our Saviour once objected to the Samaritans, will be found no less true to you, that "ye worship ye know not what," nor why.

140. But let us allow that you invoke none but what have lived and are sanctified: let us also grant that which yet the holy Fathers so much doubted of, that the saints do already enjoy the beatific vision; and therefore (according to your divinity) are capable of understanding your prayers, by whatsoever way it be that they do so: I dare yet ask you what profit is there in this service? For tell me now, I beseech you, O ye worshippers of dead men, have we not an Advocate* in heaven, Jesus Christ the righteous, who is the sole and full propitiation of our sins? Has he not promised that† whatsoever we ask the Father in *his name*, we shall receive it? Has he not told us that he is the way, the truth, and the life? and that no one can come to the Father but by him? Is it not he that has set us an example how we ought to pray? "When ye pray say, Our Father, which art in heaven." Shew us, if you can, any precept, or encouragement, or example, for going to any other. Is it that our Saviour Christ has not compassion enough for us, that you go to others as more merciful? Thus some of you I know have said; but, on the contrary, the Scripture tells us, "That we have not an High Priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities, but was in all points tempted like as we are."‡ And from thence presently infers, "Let us therefore come boldly unto the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need." Or is it finally, that the interest of the blessed

* 1 John ii. 1. † John xiv. 13. Ib. vi. 6. ‡ Heb. iv. 15, 16.

Jesus is not great enough with his Father ; unless you add a mad Francis, a bloody Dominic, a rebellious Becket, an enthusiastic Ignatius, to be joint advocates with him ? If these indeed be your thoughts, let us plainly know the impiety of them ? And upon what unchristian foundations the benefit of this practice is established by you ? But if you dare not say that any saint in heaven can prevail, where Christ alone cannot ; if you are ashamed to own, that you think any one can love us more dearly, than He who gave himself for us, and redeemed us with his own most precious blood ; or by consequence can be more ready to hear and intercede for us. Tell me then, what profit is it, that having this fountain of living water, you run to the broken cisterns of the merits and intercession of your fellow-creatures, which can hold no water.

141. But I will go yet further, to shew you the unprofitableness of this service. It was objected by a great man of your own Church : "If," says he, "the saints know our necessities and those defects which we express in our prayers ; how comes it to pass that we do not oftener find ourselves relieved by them ?"* To this he answers : "That although the saints in heaven have doubtless the greatest charity imaginable for us, yet they have withal their wills so entirely conformed to the will of God, as not to lend any assistance to us, but according to what they see the knowledge and will of God disposed towards us." An excellent reflection certainly ; and which no one can doubt to be most true. But then it will follow from it, that you do in vain solicit the saints, who cannot lend you any assistance, till God is pleased to permit himself to be entreated for you. Whilst our Heavenly Father is our enemy, all the host of heaven are so too. We must first be reconciled to him, before ever we can expect any favour or acceptance with them. In short, it was the conclusion of an ancient Father, whom I before mentioned, "that the only way to make the angels and saints our friends, is to make God so first ; and though we know little of what those blessed spirits above do for us, yet we have all the reason in the world to believe that they love and hate according to the Divine pleasure ; and if they do pray for us, the most ready way to obtain their prayers, is to be constant, and zealous, and persevering both in our prayers and piety towards God, through his Son Jesus Christ our Lord."

* Durand. in Sent. 4. d. 45. q. 4. [fol. cccclxiii. p. 1. col. 1. Par. 1508.]

142. I shall conclude this with the words of St. Augustine : " Let it not be any matter of religion to us to worship dead men ;* because if they have lived well they desire no such honour, but rather that we should worship Him, by whose illumination they rejoice that we are companions of their piety. They are therefore to be honoured for our imitation, not to be worshipped out of religion. And the same let us think of angels ; that they above all things desire that we should, together with them, worship God only, in whose vision they are happy. Tying our souls to him alone, from which religion derives its very name ; let us lay aside all superstition ; behold I worship one God, the one principle of all things. Whatsoever angel loves this God, I am sure that he loves me too. Whosoever remains in him, and can understand the prayers of men, in him he hears me. Whosoever has God for his good, does in him help me. Let the adorers of the parts of the universe tell me ; what good person is there that he does not reconcile to himself, who worships Him only whom every good person loves, and in whose knowledge he rejoices, and by recurring to which principle, he becomes good. Let therefore religion bind us to the one God Almighty," &c. But I insist too long on these reflections : I only add, secondly, to close all, That this invocation of saints departed, is as impious as it is unprofitable.

143. For, first, to take this practice in the most moderate sense that may be, yet to pray to any creature after the manner that you do to the saints departed, is to make them the objects of a proper religious worship, and to pay that service to the creature, which is due only to the Creator ; and this certainly cannot be done without a very great impiety.

144. Secondly, To pray to the saints but only as intercessors, even this does usurp upon the peculiar prerogative of our blessed Saviour, who is our only Mediator, and whose singular privilege it is to appear in the presence of God for us. And to join others with Christ in his great office and employment, to make ourselves new mediators ; what is this but tacitly, at least, to imply, that we dare not trust either his mercy, or his interest, in the concern of our everlasting salvation. But then,

145. Thirdly, To pray, as you evidently do, not only that the saints would intercede for you, but that God would be

* De Vera Religione, p. 290. Lugd. 1664.

merciful to you, not only through the merits of Christ, but of the saint whose memory you celebrate ; this is a downright undervaluing of our Saviour's blood, and does despite unto the covenant of grace.

146. Fourthly, To pray to the saints (as if we may be allowed to understand the meaning of plain words you do) as the arbitrary dispensers of benefits to you, that they would themselves grant you those things which you ask of them ; this makes your service yet more intolerable. And though you seek to avoid the justice of this censure by those unreasonable expositions of your prayers I have before refuted, yet I am sure it ought to be more than enough to make us avoid that practice which cannot be excused but by such forced interpretations, as should men use the like on other occasions, all society must be overthrown, and men's words be no longer relied upon as sufficient to declare the sense of their minds.

147. Fifthly, As to what concerns the practice of the people in this point, it cannot be denied ; nay, it is by some of your own Church openly complained of, how much their hope and confidence, their love and service, are hereby lessened towards God ; and what greater signs of zeal appear in them towards the blessed Virgin, than towards our Saviour Christ himself. And indeed, you who ought to have better informed them are the very persons that have especially helped to mislead them. It is from you they have learnt, as a great practice of piety, to salute her ten times for God's once. It is you that have taught them to join Mary still with Jesus in their mouths ; insomuch, as if it be possible, to let her name be the last expression of their dying breath. It is you that have told them, that to lift themselves into her fraternity, is one of the surest means in the world to ascertain their salvation. From you they learn in all their prayers to call upon her : at the sound of a bell thrice every day, wherever they are, or whatever they are about, to fall down upon their knees and salute her. Your confessions, absolutions, excommunications, vows, thanksgivings, visitations, commendations, conjurations, are all transacted in her name, as well as in the name of the holy Trinity. Whilst our Saviour Christ is represented by you either as still in the state of pupilage, an infant in her arms, or expiring upon his cross, she has her crown and glory about her head ; sometimes the moon under her feet, and not seldom the whole Trinity joining to set forth her honour. Her titles in all your offices are excessive ; the queen of heaven

the mother of divine grace, the mirror of righteousness, the seat of wisdom, the cause of our joy, the tower of David, the ark of the covenant, the gate of heaven, the refuge of sinners, the help of Christians, the queen of angels, patriarchs, prophets, apostles, martyrs, confessors, and all saints; these are the common names you give her, in your hymns, your litanies and prayers to her. And what impression this must make upon untutored minds, how much greater value they will be hereby apt to set upon her than upon Christ himself, every man's reason will soon tell him, and a sad experience confirms it to us.

148. But, indeed, sixthly, it is here, in the words of the prophet, "As with the people, so with the priest."* Your superstition is not at all less, though much more inexcusable than theirs. Witness those great names for whom you have appeared to be so much concerned; St. Bernard, St. Germain, St. Anselm, St. Antonine, St. Bernardine, &c., and whos blasphemous devotions I have before exposed to the world. Let the writings of Cardinal Bona, and Father Crasset, the Contemplations of the Blessed Virgin, and the late Apology for them in our own language, be considered; for I am very much mistaken, if it be possible for the most ignorant zealot to be more unreasonably extravagant, than these learned men have approved themselves to be.

149. Nor may you turn off these with your old distinction, that they are but private persons, and for whose excesses therefore your Church is not to answer. They were approved in what they did, and many of them are at this day worshipped by you as canonized saints; and it was this superstition that especially contributed to their exaltation. Who was it that composed that exorbitant hymn yet used in your Church, *Ave Maris Stella*, but your devout St. Bernard? St. Herman, another of your own order, made those others neither less extravagant nor less authorized by you, *Salve Regina*, *Alma redemptoris Mater*, and *Ave Regina Cœlorum*. And the late editor of his life tells us, that being lame in body, and dull in mind, he prayed earnestly to the blessed Virgin in this romantic manner: "Help, O help, the doubly wretched Herman."† His prayer smote the tender-hearted Virgin, and immediately she appeared to him, and offered him his choice, whether he would have firmness of body or acuteness of mind.

* Isaiah xxiv. 2.

† Calendar. Benedictin. to. 3. Jul. 19.

He chose the latter, and expressed his gratitude to his great benefactress, by composing those famous hymns before mentioned to her honour.

150. It was another of the same order, and that had, in your opinion too the greatest characters any man can pretend to,* a Pope in the Church Militant, and now a saint in the Church Triumphant, who appointed the three solemn devotions I have spoken of, to be every day paid to the blessed Virgin at the sound of a bell, and composed the Course of the Virgin, that what was done before by the monks only, might from thenceforth become the public service of the Church to her.

151. What is the great commendation that is given of St. Gerard, and he too a saint of your own order?† But that having caused an image of the blessed Virgin to be curiously wrought, he set it up in a chapel built on purpose for it, and appointed incense and sweet odours to be every day for ever burnt to it. That he taught the Hungarians to call her their Lady, having persuaded their King Stephen to make his kingdom tributary to her. In short, that he never heard the name of Mary pronounced, but he worshipped it, bowing his face towards the ground.

152. It was this was the great thing for which yet another of your order, St. Joscio, was canonized.‡ Whose piety to the Virgin whilst he lived was rewarded with a notable miracle at his death. For no sooner was he dead, but there grew five roses of an extraordinary sweetness out of his head, two out of his eyes, two out of his ears, and one out of his mouth; and upon every one of them a letter of the Virgin Mary's name; so that the whole M.A.R.I.A. was composed by them.

153. Thus has this devotion to the saints, almost wholly overcome your piety towards God. Your Devotions, your Histories, your Lives, your Miracles, are all framed to promote it. And now I am mentioning those evils which from these kind of legends have been derived to corrupt both the opinions and practice of those who are acquainted with little else than these fables; I will refer to yourself to tell me, whether you can endure to see the dignity of our Saviour, and the majesty of God himself, so lessened as it is by many of your communion, to increase the veneration of the saints?

* Pope Urban XI. Ibid. Jul. 29.

† Ibid. Sept. 24.

‡ Cal. Ben. tom. 4. Sept. 30.

154. When St. Gothardus was chosen by the Emperor Henry* to succeed Bernard in the bishopric of Hildersheim, and the monk modestly declined that honour, the blessed Virgin the same night appears to him, and sharply reproves him in this ranting rhetoric, "*Scito imperatorem meo id jussu moliri.*" "*Peccasti perveracia tua in me et Filium.*" "Know (says she) that the emperor has done this at my command; thou hast sinned by thy obstinacy against me and my Son." This indeed was as became the queen of heaven, and one would think by it, that she still maintained the right of a mother over her Son.

155. But you have dealt yet worse with our Saviour than this; your writers represent him at this day as a little child in heaven, as if he were ever to continue in the same impotent state, in which your pictures and images express him. Thus we read in the life of St. Paula,† that the blessed Virgin appeared to her with her little boy, who kissed Paula, and squeezed some of his mother's milk into her mouth. Nor was this anything extraordinary; the writer of her life assures us, that she was often wont to take him into her arms and play with him. And the like happened to many of your saints;‡ as, for instance, St. Aldegundis, St. Francisca, of whom we are told, that being committed to the care of an archangel, she did oftentimes read the Office of the blessed Virgin § in the night, by the light that proceeded from his rays; and was for her diligence in it so acceptable to the Virgin, that she several times came down from heaven to refresh her, and offered her Son to be kissed and embraced by her.

156. But the favours of the blessed Virgin to St. Ida, were of all others the most considerable. "For coming down into her cell with her *infant Jesus*, Behold (says she), O Ida! thy love: take him into thy lap, and satisfy thyself with the kisses and embraces of him whom thou lovest."|| My author goes on beyond all bounds even of common decency: but I must stop here, and not repeat those blasphemies, which cannot be read without trembling. But, O blessed Jesus! how long wilt thou suffer this dishonour? and permit an unbounded superstition to run to these excesses? I appeal to all the Christians of the world, what mean dishonourable notions must they have of the God of heaven and earth, that in such a discerning

* Ibid. ad 4. Maii, p. 320, tom. 2.

† Ib. Mart. 30.

§ Ib. Mart. 9.

† Cal. Ben. tom. 1. Jan. 5.

|| Tom. 4. p. 590. Dec. 11.

age presume to publish such romances? These stories might indeed become a Homer or a Virgil; but what is fancy in them, being applied to a Venus and a Cupid, is an unpardonable blasphemy to be thus used of the Saviour of the world, who is God over all, blessed for ever.

157. These are the effects of this superstition. I might add many other examples no less horrible, in which our blessed Lord has been diminished to make up the honour of his servants. But I shall shut up all with an impiety of another kind, though the effect of this worship; and which ought the more to be taken notice of, both because it was done by a society which would be thought at least the most zealous of any for their faith, and was exposed publicly in the sight of the sun, and before the eyes of many to whom I now write. The thing I mean is the late procession of the Jesuits at Luxembourg, May 20, 1685,* designed for the glory of the blessed Virgin, "the honoured and affectionate patroness of France and Luxembourg."

The procession, indeed, was singularly extravagant, and it needed the skill of that learned society to put profaneness into so scholastic a dress. Heathenism and Christianity walked together, as if the fathers of the society had equally revered the ancient deities of the one, as the modern deities of the other.

On the one side were carried the image of the blessed Virgin and the holy sacrament. On the other, Mars, Vulcan, the Cyclops and Naiades, Ceres, Flora, Pomona, &c. And these too with all the pomp, and even under the names of *gods* and *divinities*.

At several stations, where the procession was to rest, theatres were erected, to serve to inspire agreeably (say the learned fathers in the account which they printed of this day's work) a piety towards our Lady of Consolation. So the blessed Virgin there is called.

The second of these theatres, was for the god *Mars*, "who commands his warriors to take heed not to commit any insult from henceforth upon the chapel of our Lady of Consolation." This is Mars's care, and the device for the *god* Mars was

"Procul, ô, procul ite profani."—*Virg.*

"In the third theatre, Ceres, Flora, Pomona, &c. rejoice at

* See the Account published by that Society: La Ste. Vierge Patronne Honoree et Bienfaisante dans la France et dans le Luxembourg.

the return of our Lady of Consolation. And their motto, still under the title of divinities, was

“Jam redit et Virgo, redeunt Saturnia Regna.”

It were too long to transcribe all the other follies and impieties of this day's solemnity, in which the holy Scripture found no room; the sacrament but very little: the whole piety was designed to the blessed Virgin; and because Christianity had not gods enough in it, to set forth her glory, all the poetic deities were revived, to inspire agreeably a devotion into the people for her. This was indeed a masterpiece of contrivance; and what invention shall next be had, to excite a devotion to her we may expect to see the first time the gentlemen of the society shall have occasion to make their complying consciences do something extraordinary, for the flattery of a prince so much their friend, and therefore so much their favourite as he, for whose honour this solemn procession was in great measure designed. In the meantime I shall leave it to the reader seriously to consider what sad effects such a devotion as this has given birth to, and what just cause we have to oppose a superstition, contrary to the holy Scripture, unknown to the best and most primitive antiquity, unreasonable in itself, and which is worst of all, not only very unprofitable, but very wicked too in its practice.

ANSWER TO THE FOURTH ARTICLE.

Of Images and Relics.

In the beginning of this Article * you tell me (but with very little reason) that you might “have passed over this point without any further consideration:” the best argument you bring for it, being, if I mistake not, this, that you are not obliged to defend what I had advanced against you upon it. And indeed, though the reason be but a poor one, yet I am persuaded you had done better both for the interest of your cause, and for your own credit, to have contented yourself with it, and have passed over this Article altogether, rather than by giving such loose answers to my allegations, to have satisfied the world, that you have no just exceptions to make against them.

2. Were I minded in return to excuse myself the trouble of any farther answer to you, I could, I believe, give you some

* Reply, p. 25.

more plausible pretences for it. I might tell you, (1st,) that your distinctions are now so well known, and have been so often exploded by us, that there is no longer any danger that even "my friends the vulgar should be circumvented by them;"* I might add, (2ndly,) and that with great truth, that this whole subject has been utterly exhausted by that learned man I have so often mentioned, in his Defence of the Charge of Idolatry against T. G., and from whom you have here again borrowed your chiefest strength. I might mind you, (3rdly,) how after two endeavours to reply to him, T. G. was forced to give over; and it is now above eight years since neither he nor any of your Church has thought fit to carry on the dispute. I might desire you, (4thly,) to compare your performances upon this point with what the Representer ventured not above a year since to make a flourish with, and see if you could find out any but one thing in all you here repeat that his learned and judicious adversary had not utterly confuted. But he too has forsaken the cause, and I am now called upon to give you the same answers† that have been made to both these, and then, without pretending to be a prophet, I dare be bold to say, for all your blustering, you will go off the stage as tamely and quietly as any of your predecessors had done before you. There is a certain circle of shifts and distinctions which you all run; and no sooner are those spent but your bolt is shot; you drop the question, and begin again upon a new score.

3. These and many other reasons I might offer to decline any farther examination of this point, but I have promised you before, that I would neither misrepresent your doctrine, nor *foe off* your arguments.‡ And I will here perform it with such exactness, that even your incense and holy water shall not be forgotten. And if for our diversion you shall think fit, the next time you write, to add to these all your other follies, of holy ashes, consecrated candles, Agnus Deis, and, in one word, whatever superstitions of the like kind, your Pontifical, Ceremonial, Missal, Breviary, Office of the blessed Virgin, with all the Rationales and Comments that have ever been written upon them, can furnish you with, I do once more promise you that no pretence of their impertinence shall hinder me from sifting both them and you to the bottom. As to the present subject I shall observe this plain method:

I. I will make good the charge of image-worship against you.

* Reply, Ibid.

† Reply, Pref.

‡ Ibid.

II. I will shew you, that in this service too, you are truly and properly guilty of idolatry.

4. But before I enter into these particulars, I must stop so long as to consider the new Introduction you endeavour to amuse your reader with : viz.

SECT. I.

*Of the Benefit of Pictures and Images.**

And which brings to my mind what Tully (reckoning up the several opinions of the philosophers concerning the nature of the soul) said once of Aristoxenus,† who of a fiddler became a philosopher, and asserted the soul to be harmony ; “*Hic ab artificio suo non recessit, et tamen aliquid dixit.*” You tell us then,

5. *Reply*, §. 19.] “That they are the books of the ignorant, silent orators, apt to increase in us the love of God and his saints, and (O elegant!) *blow up the dying coals of our affections into a flame of devotion*, that the representations of holy persons, and of their glorious actions, do by their powerful eloquence inflame us towards an imitation of their graces and virtues, and renew in us afresh the memory of the persons whom they represent, with a reverence and respect for them.”‡

6. *Ans.*] In all which, though you fight with your own shadow, and say nothing that either contradicts our principles concerning worship, or justifies your practices ; yet have you been so unhappy as to offer just matter for our animadversion : For,

First, It is no small mistake in you, thus to join pictures and images together, as if they were all one ; when yet both your own superstition, and the opinion both of the Jews and Gentiles (as to the point of worshipping of them) have always made a very great difference between them. As for the ancient heathens, they adored their Γλυπτά, statues, or graven images ; because they conceived them most apt to be animated by their gods, of which they were the resemblances. Whereas pictures were not thought so capable of receiving that animation. The same was the distinction of the Jews too, who upon this very account have always looked upon the former sort of sculptures§ to be the thing especially for-

* Reply, p. 26.

† Reply, p. 26, 27.

‡ Tusc. Qu. l. 1. sect. 17.

§ בולטת העוררה

bidden in the second commandment;* insomuch that they thought it unlawful to have them even for ornament; but for pictures painted or woven,† those they did not esteem to be absolutely forbidden to them. And at this day in your Church,‡ your images are set up with solemn consecrations to receive your adoration. But I do not know that any pictures are dedicated for altar-pieces, or other uses, with the like solemnity.

2. Another confusion of the like kind you make in what follows, in speaking of the pictures not only of holy persons, but of their actions too. For everybody knows how much more use there may be, and how much less danger there certainly is in historical representations, than in single figures, but especially carved images.

3. Were the benefit of images never so great, yet you know this is neither that which we dispute with you, nor for which they are set up in your churches. Your Trent Synod expressly defines that due veneration is to be paid to them. Your Catechism says that they are to be had not only for instruction, but for worship. And this is the point in controversy betwixt us. We retain pictures, and sometimes even images too in our churches for ornament, and (if there be such uses to be made of them) for all the other benefits you have now been mentioning. Only we deny that any service is to be paid to them; or any solemn prayers to be made at their consecration, for any divine virtues, or indeed for any virtues at all, to proceed from them. This is our business; the rest is all impertinence in such discourses as these, where men are to dispute, not harangue. And for images set up in churches, with these ceremonies, and for this purpose, I add,

4. That were the benefits of them otherwise never so great, yet will not this be any manner of excuse to you, for the violating of God's law, seeing, as we have been often told, and you indeed do yourself confess, no evil is to be done, for any good whatsoever that may come of it. Though now,

5. I am not altogether satisfied of the great usefulness of images for the instruction of the ignorant. They may indeed serve to call good things and persons to their remembrance, when they have before been instructed, and by consequence in that respect are no longer ignorant of what is represented by them. But let a man, that is properly ignorant, *i. e.* who

* Maimon. See Dr. Hamm. of Idolatry, sect. 40. [vol. 1. p. 350. Lond. 1784.]

† משוקעת

‡ Id. Ibid.

never heard of the 12th (for instance) of the Revelations,* see the Virgin Mary ten thousand times painted with a half-moon under her feet, I do not believe he would become one jot the wiser for it. Nay,

6. In opposition to your pretences, though all this is out of the way, yet I dare affirm, lastly, that for such images and pictures that are too often found both in your churches and houses, they are so far from serving to any of those uses you pretend, that on the contrary, if men are not very well instructed, they will be apt to beget in them most pernicious notions, contrary to the honour of God, to the nature of our Saviour Christ, and to the covenant of his Gospel.

7. For tell me, I beseech you, was not this the great reason wherefore God† forbade any resemblance to be made of himself under the law,‡ that it was a lessening and debasing of his nature so to do? And does not St. Paul urge this very consideration against the Athenian idolatry?§ Acts xvii. 29; and is not the Divine nature as excellent now, and as much debased by yours, as ever it was by their representations of it? I need not tell you of the frequent pictures of God the Father in the shape of an old man, and commonly in a Pope's dress; and the meaning of which (if one may conjecture the design of this, by the natural tendency of it) can be no other than this, *viz.* to persuade the ignorant, that as you sometimes call the Pope a god on earth, so God is no other than the Pope of heaven.

8. And this, were it only in some sacred places, would yet be too profane for any pious Christian to endure. But alas! you have not been so reserved. Every office carries this abuse in it; hardly a Psalter or Catechism without it: nay, I will add, what I should hardly be credited in, had not thousands among us with indignation beheld it, that in the open streets of your cities, we may see that God, "who is over all, blessed for ever," exposed to the scorn and meanness of a sign-post.

9. How miserably have you by these pictures, abused the mystery of the sacred Trinity? Sometimes you make it a monster, as where you paint one body with three heads; one head with three faces; sometimes one body with two heads, and a pigeon in the midst; of which Cardinal Capisucchi|| makes mention. The sacred Trinity in the belly of the Virgin, which Gerson¶ says, he saw with his own eyes in a church of

* Rev. xii. 1.

§ Acts xvii. 29.

† Deut. iv. 15.

|| Capisucchi, p. 613.

‡ Isaiah xi. 18.

¶ Gerson.

the Carmelites; the most ordinary figures are, either an old man holding a crucifix in his hands, and a pigeon upon his shoulder; or (as in your Eye-Catechism), on one side an old man with a globe, on the other a younger with a cross upon his shoulder, and a dove betwixt them: and what is all this but to debase the glorious Godhead? In St. Paul's phrase,* "to change the truth of God into a lie, by representing the incorruptible God by an image made like unto a corruptible man?" And where is there a Christian so insensible of that dishonour that is hereby done to the Majesty of that God, whom the wiser heathens themselves never debased to the likeness of any created being, as not, with the same Apostle,† to have his spirit stirred within him, at the sight of such impiety?

10. Nor are you at all less excusable in your representations of our blessed Saviour and the holy Virgin; not to descend to any other of the saints. For besides that such similitudes exhibit only one, and that his inferior nature, *viz.* his manhood; how do these pictures insensibly breed a mean opinion of him in the minds of the ignorant and unwary? As, 1st, Nothing is more ordinary in the most solemn places of your worship, than to see our blessed Lord still set forth as a child in the arms of his mother. And what notions this has bred in many of your communion, I would to God the greater esteem they seem to have for the Virgin than for Christ, did not too plainly shew. But that which renders this more intolerable, is, that you thus represent him not only upon earth, but at this time even in heaven; and indeed, seeing in your legends, you speak of him as a child still, I do not wonder if in your pictures you represent him too as such.

11. Thus, in one of your Eye-Catechisms, set forth in Portugal, for the instruction of the people, the latter part of the Ave-Maria is set in this manner before them. All sorts of men and women upon earth, are drawn in an open scene, upon their knees, and hands lifted up to heaven, and in the clouds over them, the blessed Virgin in glory with our Saviour (as a child) in her arms, and under it this inscription, "O holy Mary, mother of God, pray for us sinners now, and in the hour of death. Amen. Jesus."

12. In the Calendar of the Saints of your order, there is a figure of St. Odilo,‡ devoting himself to the blessed Virgin in

* Rom. i. 23, 25.

† Acts xvii.

‡ Tom. 1. Jan. 1.

this manner : "O most holy Virgin, and mother of the Saviour of all ages, receive me from this day forward as your servant, and in all my causes, be my most merciful advocate. For from this time, after God, I set nothing before thee, but voluntarily deliver myself for ever to be your possession, as your proper servant. Amen." Above him sits the blessed Virgin in glory, with our Saviour in her arms, holding her about the neck, after the manner of a little child. Many of the like kind are there in those volumes; but I may not insist upon them; I will add only some of those figures, in which the whole Trinity are made to concur to her honour. Thus in the office of the Virgin, printed at Antwerp, she is set forth in glory in heaven, with God the Father on the one side, and God the Son on the other, holding a crown over her head, the Holy Ghost above overshadowing her, and all the people on the earth below adoring.

13. I will not deny but that these may be very good instructions for Father Crasset's, or Dr. J. C.'s disciples. But I cannot see how any of the expounding and representing party, will be able to prove such pictures as these to be much for the edification of the people. I shall finish these remarks (which have already run out into a greater length than I designed, though I might have added more) with the account which the learned Gerard Vossius gives us of a picture over an altar in Flanders, in which that blasphemous epigram is expressed of men's doubting whether they should run to the blood of Christ, in which alone there is redemption to be obtained, or to the milk of the Virgin. This is certainly to contradict the very foundation of the Gospel; and to lead the ignorant into error in that point in which it is of all others the most dangerous to be mistaken; *viz.* whether they ought to place the hopes of their salvation in the redemption of Christ, or in the mercy and interest of his mother.

14. You may at your leisure consider how to improve these things into helps of devotion, and useful instructions for the illiterate populace. I might have added, what has lately been elsewhere observed, of the profaneness of many (in Italy especially) in this point; where the most celebrated Madonnas are the pictures of the painters' whores, set up in their churches as objects of the people's veneration. But this, and other excesses of the like kind, I purposely forbear, lest I should be thought to please myself in your impieties, which I heartily lament, and earnestly beseech God to reform in you. Nor

should I have said thus much, but only to shew how little reason you had to enter on this new and most impertinent subject of the benefit of images; and that, were our cause to be tried by this alone, we might even so expect to carry it against you. And this to your first pretence.

15. The next thing you offer in favour of your images, is [*Reply*, §. 20.], "that there is now no danger of idolatry in this practice, seeing all persons are taught that there is but one God, to whom adoration is only due; and therefore, that they cannot be capable of erring so grossly as to give divine honour to an image, or to think any virtue annexed to them for which they ought to be adored. In short, it is (you say) by the subtlety of the devil, who hates anything that excites devotion, that these helps to piety are now branded with the horrid note of idolatry, and Catholics represented as if they paid the act of adoration to the images themselves."

16. *Answ.*] That the devil is an enemy to piety, and to all those things that may any way serve to promote it, I can easily believe; but that it is he who, upon this account, stirs up us to oppose your idolatry, I shall hardly credit, though you should give me as good an assurance of it, as ever your brother, the old monk, did the second Council of Nice, when he told them, that the devil himself had confessed to him how much he hated your holy and venerable images.* I am sure Tertullian was so far from this, that he thought it was the devil that instigated men to bring them into the world, and not to help to cast them out. But, to overthrow at once both your reflection and argument together, I do here roundly affirm, that what you say is so far from being true, that there is now no danger of idolatry in the worship of images; that, on the contrary, I will shew, that in the worship of them, publicly authorized and practised amongst you, you do actually commit it; and then everybody will see what spirit it is that acts in opposition to this service, and who it is that blinds you so far, as to make you contend for that which both the holy Scripture condemns, and the primitive Christians neither knew, nor would have endured. And this brings me to my first proposal, wherein I am—

* De Idololatriâ.

SECT. II.

To make good the charge of Image-worship against you, and answer those evasions by which you endeavour to clear yourselves of it.

17. Now, that you give religious worship to images, has been so fully proved in that learned book I have before referred you to, in answer to T. G., both from the definitions of your Councils of Nice and Trent, and from the unanimous voice of almost all the great men of your Church who have written anything of this matter, that I shall need say but very little here in confirmation of it. And therefore, not to multiply quotations by transcribing what has been already collected as to this matter, I shall content myself with this plain, and, I think, unexceptionable manner of proceeding against you :

First, I will propose to you the voice of your Church in her definitions.

Secondly, I will give you the interpretation of her sense in these definitions from Cardinal Capisucchi only, and out of that book to which Monsieur de Meaux himself appeals.

Thirdly, I will, from both, vindicate the account I have given of the practice of your Church, in conformity to these principles.

18. First, For what concerns the first of these, the voice of your Church, as to this point ; the Council of Trent declares, "that the images of Christ, of the blessed Virgin, and of the saints, are more especially to be had and retained in temples, and that due honour and veneration is to be paid to them ; not that it should be believed that there is any divinity or virtue in them for which they are to be worshipped, or that anything is to be asked of them, or that any trust is to be put in images, but because the honour which is given to them is referred to the prototypes which they represent ; so that, by the images which you kiss, and before which you uncover your heads and fall down, you adore Christ, and worship the saints which they represent."

Thus that wary Synod, neither determining what honour should be given to images, nor yet setting any bounds to any. But then, as it expressly allows them the external marks of divine worship, so, by fixing the grounds of this honour to be the passing of it to the prototype, not only Soto, Turrian, and

Naclantus, three great divines concerned in that Synod, but also the generality of those who have treated since of this matter, have concluded, that the same adoration is to be paid to the image and the prototype; so that, if Christ himself be worshipped with divine worship, then must the crucifix also be worshipped with the very same. But this will better appear,

19. Secondly, From the account I am to give of the doctrine of your Church, as to this worship, from Cardinal Capisucchi.

And to whose book since Monsieur de Meaux has thought fit to appeal, I am content to submit the decision of this controversy to his sentence, and shall leave the world to judge whether I have misrepresented, or whether the Bishop and you have not departed from, the doctrine of the Council of Trent.

20. Now, that we may know precisely what, in his opinion, that due honour and veneration is which you pay to images, and which the Council so cautiously declined the telling us, we will consider, first of all, what was thought to be so by them, whose opinions he rejects as not fully delivering your Church's sense. Such were,

21. First of all, Durandus,* "who thought that, properly speaking, the images are not to be adored; but because they resemble things worthy adoration, which, by remembrance, are adored in presence of the images, therefore the images themselves improperly are, and may be said to be, adored." Now, this he rejects, because (says he) in truth it takes away "the worship of images,"† and concludes it, with another of your great men, Raphael de Tuire, to be "dangerous, rash, and savouring of heresy," or, as Ferdinandus Velosillus phrases it, "false, rash, and erroneous," but especially since the definition of the Council of Trent.

22. The next whose opinion he rejects is Vasquez,‡ "who taught that the images themselves were no otherwise to be adored, but because in the presence of them, and about them, are exhibited the external signs of honour, such as, kneeling, kissing, uncovering the head, &c.; but that, for the inward act of adoration, this was by no means to be directed to the image, but to the thing represented by the image." And this, too, he rejects upon the same grounds that he did the foregoing, *viz.* "because that, by asserting that the inward act of the adorer

* Card. Capis. Controv. p. 624, 625. † Ibid. 625.

‡ Card. Capis. Ibid. par. 2. p. 625.

terminates only upon the thing represented by the image, he does by consequence affirm, that the images themselves are not *truly and properly to be adored.*"

23. The next opinion which he rejects,* is that whereby an inferior honour is supposed due to images, and not an honour of the same kind with that which is paid to the exemplar. And this has been proposed with some variety. Catharine and Peresius thought that no other worship besides this inferior, honorary respect, was due to them. Sanders distinguished, that the images, considered by themselves, and without any regard had to the exemplars, deserved only an inferior honour, but being conjunctly with the exemplar, were to be worshipped with the very same worship that the exemplars themselves were. And this was also the opinion of Suarez, "that images, considered only as sacred utensils, were to have no other honour than was usually given to any other the like holy things, but that, being considered as images, they were to have the very same worship with the prototypes whom they represented." Lorca delivered his opinion yet more subtilly: "1. That the image of Christ might by accident be adored with the same adoration as Christ himself, but that this was only improperly called the adoration of the image, it being Christ himself that alone was truly and properly adored. 2. That, for that adoration which terminates on the image, it is an adoration much inferior to that wherewith Christ himself is adored. 3. That, though the adoration wherewith the image of Christ is adored be, in the kind of the act, different from that with which Christ himself is worshipped, yet that it proceeds from the same habit, the virtue of religion, from which the adoration of Christ himself proceeds, and upon that account may be called by the same name with it." And all these opinions the Cardinal still rejects upon his old principle, "that the image is adored with the very same act with which Christ himself is adored," and, by consequence, must be worshipped with the same divine worship.

24. The next whose opinion he refutes is Cardinal Bellarmine,† who supposed that "the worship which is properly given to an image, is not the same, with that which (for instance) is given to Christ himself, but a sort of imperfect worship, which may, by a certain analogy, be reduced to the same kind of worship that is paid to the exemplar; but yet

* Capis. par. 4. p. 634, 635.

† Id. par. 5. p. 636.

that the image may by accident be worshipped with the same worship as the exemplar, when the exemplar is considered as shining forth in its image, which requires properly, and in its own nature, the very same worship that is paid to the exemplar which it represents."

25. Lastly, Cardinal Lugo's opinion * was, that the image and the exemplar were to be adored as two distinct objects of adoration; as, when a man sees the son of his friend, he at the same time loves both the son and the father, not together with the very same act, yet both directly—the son for the father's sake, and the father accidentally upon the occasion of the son's bringing him to his remembrance. Thus, in the present case, "when a Christian beholds the image of Christ, presently he calls his blessed Saviour to mind, and directly worships both the image for Christ's sake, and Christ for his own." And this also the Cardinal rejects, not so much for that it does not give sufficient honour to the image (for Lugo hath held that the same divine honour was to be given both to Christ and his image) as because it distinguished the objects; whereas, according to Cardinal Capisuechi, "Christ and his image are to be adored, not only with the same act, but also as the same object of worship."

26. Having thus rejected all those several opinions, he finally concludes, "That the true opinion, and which ought to be held, is, that the worship of the images and the exemplars, is one and the same; so that the worship of the images is not distinct from that of the exemplars, but they are both worshipped together."† This he proves to be the *Church's sense* by a cloud of witnesses, from St. Thomas to this day; and shews it to be what both the second Council of Nice and the latter Synod of Trent designed in their definitions. And then finally closes all with the instance of Ægidius Magistralis, I heretofore mentioned, who having denied that divine worship was to be paid to images, was forced by the Inquisition to recant and abjure it as heretical; and exhorts "all those to consider it who find fault with St. Thomas for saying, that the *cross and images of Christ were to be adored with supreme divine worship.*"‡

27. And this may suffice by the way to answer your exception against the authority of Aquinas; who as you see allowed

* Card. Capis. Contr. par. 6. p. 367.

† Ibid. par. 7. p. 639.

‡ Vid. p. 649.

a true and proper worship* to be paid to the cross as well as to Christ. And that you may not shift off this *Reply* (as you have done my former Answer) only with scorn and derision, I must mind you, that it is not now a doctor† of the populace whom you think incapable of penetrating into the profound mysteries of scholastic niceties, that says this; but Cardinal Capisucchi, a schoolman and disciple himself of St. Thomas, and whom perhaps you will allow to have as deep a reach as yourself in these matters. For Vasquez, having brought the very same interpretation of Aquinas's doctrine that you now insist upon against me, the Cardinal thus roundly answers, "That according to St. Thomas,‡ the image of Christ is absolutely and simply to be adored with the same adoration with which Christ is adored: and that therefore the same adoration which is given to Christ, ought to be given to his image also."

27. And thus have I in short laid before you the sum of this Cardinal's doctrine, who both approved Monsieur de Meaux's Exposition, and to whom Monsieur de Meaux himself appeals for the vindication of this very part of it. I have already sufficiently shewn how inconsistent these two are with one another; I will now only apply what I have here further added to my former account of this matter, to the point before us. And,

28. First, It may not be amiss to observe what great diversity of opinions there has been in stating of that worship which is paid by you to images, and what difficulty you have found to defend your practice against that charge of idolatry we have so justly brought against you upon the account of it. How the caution of some, and the distinctions of others amongst you, have been branded by the rest as scandalous and erroneous; and one forced to abjure as heretical, what others have set up as the only true exposition and representation of the Church's sense. And this you will give me leave the rather to remark, because you are so often pleased to reflect upon our divisions, which yet are neither so frequent nor dangerous, as among you, who pretend not only to truth, but infallibility in all you believe. And if the consequence you are wont from thence to draw against us, that because we differ in some things, therefore we have no cer-

* Reply, p. 29, 30, 31.

† Reply, p. 31.

‡ Capis. Contr. p. 630.

tainty in any, be good (as you say it is), you may now see that it will equally fall upon yourselves too; and by so much the more heavily, by how much your pretences in this matter are greater than ours. But,

29. Secondly, Though there be then such a diversity of opinions amongst you as to this worship, yet it is to be remarked, that they who have allowed the least honour to images have yet still confessed that some honour was due to them. "In this (says Capisucchi) all Catholics do agree, that images are to be worshipped, and are rightly worshipped by the faithful.* Even Durandus himself, who disapproves the images of the holy Trinity, yet allows both the use and worship of other holy images." From whence therefore I conclude that those, in this Cardinal's opinion, are no Catholics, who tell us that, "all the honour they have for them,† is only such a respect as they pay to any other sacred utensils. That if they seem to act in their presence some external signs of veneration, this is meant *only* to the persons whom they represent, but *not* to the images themselves, which can claim *nothing* of that *kind* from us. In short as Monsieur de Meaux expounds it, that they do *not worship* the images; no, *God forbid*; but only make use of them to call to mind the originals. The Council of Trent teaches *no other use* of them."

30. Thirdly, It may from hence farther appear, that the worship which this Cardinal thought due to images, was not an improper, accidental, abusive worship, but a true, proper, and real adoration; the image being to be adored in the very same act with which the exemplar was. So that now, according to this exposition, the cross of Christ is to be worshipped truly and properly with a supreme divine adoration. And that not only as to the outward acts, but by the inward sense of the soul too; all which are so to be paid to Christ, as to terminate at once both upon him, and upon the crucifix, by which he is to be adored. And this,

31. Fourthly, We are to look upon, not as a private opinion, or a mere scholastic nicety, but as the true and proper sense of the Church, and to be held of all. So the Cardinal expressly declares, as being the doctrines of the Councils both of Nice and Trent; and for denying of which Ægidius Magistralis was by the Inquisition forced to recant, and renounce his doctrine contrary thereunto as heretical.

* Capis. *ibid.* p. 605.

† Reply, Pref. p. 17, 18.

32. This is an instance which with Cardinal Capisucchi I will take the liberty to recommend to your consideration. For certainly if what he says be true, you who deny that the cross is upon any account whatsoever to be worshipped with divine worship,* can be no otherwise than a downright heretic. And though you are at present secure in a happy expounding country, where you may safely make what representation of your doctrine you please, or rather that the necessity of your present circumstances moves you to do, without any other danger than that of losing your credit with honest and inquisitive men, which you do not seem much to value; yet should time and other circumstances invite you hereafter into a hotter climate, you might run some worse hazards among those who have not given themselves up to your innovations. It happened not many years since, that a French gentleman,† being travelling in the East Indies, fell into some company at Goa, and there discoursing about matters of religion, according to your principles maintained, “that the crucifix was no otherwise to be adored, than by reporting all the honour to our Saviour Christ represented by that image.” And another time he fortuneed to say of an ivory crucifix which hung up at his bed’s head, “that it was only a piece of ivory.” For this he was clapt into the Inquisition, and after some years imprisonment for his heretical sayings, hardly escaped the fire, with this sentence,‡ “that he was declared excommunicate; that for reparation of his fault, all his goods should be confiscated; himself banished the Indies, and condemned to serve in the galleys (or public prisons) of Portugal five years; and further accomplish those other penances which should more particularly be enjoined him by the Inquisitors.” As for his crime, it is thus set forth in the preamble to his sentence, “that he had said that we ought *not* to *adore images*; and had *blasphemed* against that of a certain crucifix, by saying of a crucifix of ivory, that it was a piece of ivory.”

33. This was plain dealing, and a sensible conviction that it is not merely a scholastic nicety with the fathers of the Inquisition, “that the *cross* is to be worshipped with *divine worship*.” The truth is, the contrary opinion of Durandus, Holcot, Mirandula, and some others (and who allowed all the acts of external honour to be paid to them, only they denied them that inward veneration which makes it properly a religious

* Reply, Pref.

† Relation del’Inquisition de Goa, p. 14, 15. cap. 2. 21. cap. 3.

‡ Ibid. cap. 27. p. 151, 152. Edit. Leyd. 1687.

worship) has been always esteemed as false and scandalous, and savouring of heresy; and is expressly censured as such by those great men, Saurez, Medina, Victoria, Catharine, Arriaga, Cabrera, Raphael de Turre, Velloillus, and many others at large, collected by Cardinal Capisucchi on this occasion, as abettors with himself, of a true divine adoration to be paid to the holy cross, and other images of God, and the blessed Trinity. I go on finally from these principles,

34. Thirdly, To vindicate the account I have heretofore given of your practices in consequence to this doctrine.

And, first, I observed that in the solemn procession made at the reception of the Emperor, the Legate's cross is appointed by the Pontifical to take place of the Emperor's sword, because *latría*, or *divine worship*, is due to it.

35. This you cannot deny to be faithfully quoted out of your Pontifical: but you say "there is some kind of impropriety in the speech;* and we must understand it so, not as if divine worship was due to the cross, but to Christ crucified upon it." A strange liberty of interpreting this, which turns plain affirmatives into downright negatives; and this contrary to the sense not only of your greatest authors (as I have shewn) but in their opinion contrary to the sense of your Church too. These all say with the Rubric, "that a divine worship is due to the cross:" you declare it is no such thing; "No, God forbid. Such worship is upon *no account whatsoever* to be given to the cross, but only to Christ represented by the cross." I will not desire you to consider what wise arguing you make of what your Pontifical here says; that the cross must take place of the Emperor's sword, because Christ is to be worshipped with divine worship: it shall suffice me to leave you to the censures of your own learned writers and Inquisitors, who have already pronounced this exposition to be false, scandalous, and savouring of heresy. Only let me once more caution you to remember the hard fate of poor Monsieur Imbert, of *Ægidius Magistralis*, and the French traveller I just now mentioned: for however it may be safe enough to dissemble with us here, yet will it behove you to take great heed that you alter your tone, if ever you should chance to fall into those parts where the Old Popery doctrine is still the measure of the Inquisitor's proceedings.

36. My next instance was from your form of blessing a new

* Reply, p. 31.

cross: to your cavil about my omitting some words, I have said enough heretofore; but the dear calumny must be continued, though not only those two words were added, but so many more set down, that you seem as much dissatisfied with my length here, as you pretended to be with my brevity before.

37. You pray, "That the wood of the cross which you bless, may be a wholesome remedy to mankind; a strengthener of faith: an increaser of good works; the redemption of souls; a comfort, protection, and defence against the cruel darts of the enemy.

"You incense it; you sprinkle it with holy water; you sanctify it in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; and then both the bishop and people devoutly *adore* it, and kiss it."

38. This is in short the sum of that ceremony; in which you desire to know what is amiss? I answer, That take this whole office together, with the ceremonies, prayers, and other circumstances of it, and it is superstitious and idolatrous; and I shall not doubt once more to repeat, what before so much offended you, that the addresses you here make look more like magical incantations than Christian prayers. For,

39. First, If we inquire into the design of this ceremony; it is to consecrate a piece of wood or stone, that it may become a fit object of adoration; which being directly contrary to the second commandment, cannot be done without a very great sin.

40. Secondly, To this end you pray that several benefits may proceed from this wood of the cross; and if those words signify any thing, whereby you beseech God, that it may be a wholesome remedy to mankind, a strengthener of faith, &c. we must then look upon it, that you do believe, that by this consecration there is a virtue, if not residing in it for all these purposes, yet at least proceeding from it; which your Council of Trent confesses was one of the things that made worship of images among the Heathens to be idolatrous. Nor will your little evasions here stand you in any stead; that "you pray only that the cross may be a means for the obtaining all these benefits, and that this is no more than a preacher may desire for his sermon, or the author of a good book for what he is about to publish."* For, first, A piece of wood or stone, carve

* Reply, p. 32.

it into what figure or shape you please, is not certainly so proper a means for the conveying of such benefits to men, as a good book or a good sermon are: and therefore what may be very naturally desired for the one, cannot without great superstition be applied to the other. I may, and I heartily do pray, that what I am now writing may be a saving remedy to you, by correcting your faith, and increasing your charity; because I am persuaded here are arguments proper to such an end, if it shall please God to dispose you impartially to consider them; but now, I believe, you would think me very extravagant, should I pray to God to sanctify the paper on which it is printed, or my bookseller's sign that sells it, as you pray to God to sanctify the *wood* of the cross; that as often as you see the leaves of this book, or look upon the Rose and Crown in St. Paul's Church-yard, these good effects may be wrought in you.

41. Again, secondly, As the thing itself is not a proper means of producing these effects in us, so the manner by which you pray it may be done, renders it yet more superstitious. To get instruction by hearing or reading; to have one's faith confirmed, or charity enlarged, or zeal heightened, by pious considerations, or powerful motives, all this is very natural; and we may therefore lawfully pray to God for to bless them to us in order to these ends. But to pray to God, that by bowing ourselves down before a cross, we may find health of soul and body; to sanctify a piece of wood, that by *its merits* it may free men from all the sins they have committed, this must be more than a natural effect, neither the thing nor action being proper to produce it; and whether such requests be not more like magical incantations than Christian prayers, I shall leave it to any indifferent person to consider.

42. But, thirdly, That this which you pretend is not all that your Church designs by those prayers, is evident, in that this exposition cannot possibly be applied to several of those things which you ask of God in those addresses. For instance, you pray, "that the blessing of the wood upon which our Saviour hung, may be in the wood of the cross which you consecrate; and that by the holiness of that, he would sanctify this; that as by that cross, the world was delivered from guilt, so by the merits of this, the devout souls who offer it, may be free from all sins they have committed." Now tell me in conscience, if you dare speak the truth, is not all this somewhat more, than to pray that the cross may accidentally

become a means of working good effects in you, by putting you in mind of the price of your redemption? * Do you not here see somewhat, which your Council of Trent calls the idolatry of the Gentiles? *viz.* an encouragement to worship the cross, as if some divine virtue were in it, for which it ought to be adored. For so certainly he must do, who believes that by these prayers, the blessing of that cross, on which our Saviour hung, is in this which he worships; and that bowing down before it, he shall find health both of soul and body. Nay, but,

43. Fourthly, I must once more ask you that question I before proposed on this occasion; and which, though you heartily rail at, yet you shift it off without answering one wise word to it. If you design no real virtue to proceed from the cross which you thus consecrate, nor allow any adoration to be paid to it, but intend it merely for a memorative sign, and no more: to what purpose all these prayers, and sprinklings, and smokings, and blessings, and other ceremonies for the consecration of it? As to your question, why we dedicate our churches to God? I will then allow it to be a parallel, when you can prove that we pray that God would sanctify the walls or seats of them, that they may become a wholesome remedy to mankind, and by their merits free us from all sins we have committed. In the mean time it shall suffice to tell you, that as all we design in those ceremonies, is no more than a solemn setting of it apart for prayer and devotion to God only; so all we desire, is, that God would vouchsafe favourably to accept our offering of that place to his service, and give a blessing to those holy offices that are from thenceforth to be performed in it.

44. But, fifthly, and to conclude this point, He that would know what your intention in these prayers is, need only consider what prayers you make in behalf of other things of the same nature; and in which you so evidently desire a divine virtue may proceed from the very things themselves which you sanctify, that there is no doubt to be made of it. I shall give but one instance of this, *viz.* the prayer you make at the consecration of your *Agnus Deis*; in which you thus address yourselves to God.

“Do thou vouchsafe to bless +, sanctify +, and con + secrate them, that being sanctified by thy liberal benediction, they

* Reply, p. 32, 33.

may receive the same virtue against all diabolical subtleties, and the deceits of the evil spirit, that for those who carry them devoutly about them, no tempest may prevail against them, no adversity may get the dominion over them, no pestilent breath, no corruption of the air, no falling sickness, no storm at sea, no fire, nor any iniquity may overcome them, or prevail against them.”*

45. Such are the admirable virtues which you desire may proceed from these little images; and by the prayers you make at the consecrating of these, we may easily understand how to interpret your addresses for the same purpose in the other. But now to make your practice exactly parallel with the old Heathen superstition, I must observe, “That it is not enough that you carry these *Agnus Deis* devoutly about you, but they must be worshipped too;” for so your prayer of consecration says;

“Bless +, and sanctify +, these blessed things, that through the *veneration* and *honour* of them, the crimes of us thy servants may be blotted out.”

And now I shall leave it to you, to try once more your gift of expounding, and see if you can bring all this to your new sense. And for your encouragement in it, I will promise you if you can, to give you something more of this matter, which will be more difficult, and which I forbear at present to insist upon.

46. I shall now go on to the next instance; but I must entreat the reader's excuse, if I stop one moment to follow your rambling discourse in two points, as little to your purpose, as the handling of them will appear to have been for your reputation.

47. I. The first is concerning the use of holy water.

Reply.] “Which you tell us was established by Pope Alexander I. Anno 121, and is good for dispelling incantations, and magic frauds, rather than introducing them; and has been famed for sundry miracles, which God has been pleased to work thereby in several ages.”†

48. *Ans.*] For the antiquity of this usage, I wonder you should stop at Pope Alexander I. when had you but looked into the Clementine Constitutions‡ (a much more

* Sacrar. Cerem. lib. i. c. de Consecr. Agn. Dei.

Reply, p. 33.

† Lib. 8. cap. 35. [cap. 29.] [Labbe, Concil. vol. 1. 494. Lut. Par. 1671.]

authentic piece than your Decretal Epistle), you might have found St. Matthew to have been the author of it. And the one would have been as easily believed as the other.

49. Nor have you been less defective in setting out the benefits of it, than you were in your account of its antiquity. And therefore to spare your modesty, I will help to publish them for you. "Holy water then (if all be true that is in print) is good, not only to drive away evil spirits, but moreover to cure infirmities; to wipe out venial sins; to cleanse the pollutions of defiled consciences; to cure distractions; to elevate the mind, and dispose it for devotion; to obtain grace, and dispose men for the holy sacrament. It cures barrenness, preserves the health, purges the air from pestilential vapours;"* besides a great many other good things that are not so fit to be named. All the mischief is, that it is not certain it does any of these things; because (as Bellarmine† well observes) there is no promise of God made to it; but yet being sanctified by the prayers of the Church for these ends, you may as securely believe it, as many other things that have no better foundation.

50. And are not these now rare follies for a man to force us to publish whether we will or no? Did ever any mountebank set out his false ware with greater vanity, than those of the Church of Rome have here done theirs? And indeed, was there ever less reason to believe his remedies, than in this case there is to credit your pretences? In short, seeing you sanctify water in the name of God, by prayer for these ends, either shew us some promise, some warrant at least from the Holy Spirit of God so to do; or all reasonable men will look upon this, after all ye have said for it, as none of the least both of your follies, and of your superstitions.

II. The other thing you mention is your incense.

51. And this is indeed to our purpose; and I shall presently shew you how little you considered your own interest in the mention of it. I pass by your pretended significations of it, as impertinent in a discourse where truth only is sought. For the antiquity of it, you refer us to Dionysius, and St. Ambrose; in which you again shew your skill in Church history. The one of those being an author that lived not till

* See Domenico Magri *Notizia de vocaboli Ecclesiastici in aqua Benedicta*. [p. 41. Rom. 1669.] Marsilius Columna *Hydragiolog.* Sect. 3. c. 2. [p. 281, &c. Rom. 1686.]

† *De Cultu ss.* l. 3. c. 7. p. 2226. B. [vol. 2. p. 497. n. 20. ut supra.]

the latter end of the fourth century, and the other probably much later. But now the use of incense, in the Greek church especially, was of a much earlier date. The Apostolical Canons speak expressly of it: and if that oration of Hypolytus about the end of the world, be truly his, as from St. Jerome's mentioning of it in his catalogue it seems to be; we have then two considerable instances to assure us that it was in use in the Greek Church even in the third century. You see how far I am from detracting any thing from the force of your argument: but yet now after all, without fear of censuring primitive antiquity in this matter, whose innocence I as freely acknowledge, as I heartily honour its piety; I shall not doubt to say that the present usage of it in your Church, is so far from being innocent, that it is in truth superstitious and idolatrous.

First, It is superstitious. For indeed what else can we make of your praying to God (as in this very ceremony of consecrating a cross, you do), that "He would bless+, and sanctify+, this creature of incense,* that all weaknesses and infirmities, and all the snares of the enemy perceiving its smell, may fly and be separated from his creatures, that they may never be hurt by the biting of the old serpent, who have been redeemed with the precious blood of his Son."

53. Now if you make this prayer in faith, that it is pleasing to God, and have a confidence that it shall be accepted by him, you must then shew us some grounds, some security in the word of God for it. But if you cannot do this, what is it but superstition, that is, a vain and fond service, to entreat the favour of God in the usage of a thing to which he has neither annexed any promise, nor for the doing whereof has he any where given us the least encouragement. But,

54. Secondly, The use you make of this incense, is yet worse than the consecration of it. You offer it up to creatures, nay, to the very images which you worship; and in doing of which, I do not see how you will excuse yourselves of being guilty of idolatry. That the burning of incense was part of that religious worship under the law, which God was pleased to appropriate to himself only, is not to be denied. It was indeed a more peculiar act of divine worship, than that of bloody sacrifices themselves. And therefore both the altar on which it was offered, was covered with gold, and it stood in a

* Pontifical. Rom. de Benedict. Nov. Cruc. [vol. 2. p. 273. Rom. 1739]

more holy place than that of the burnt-offerings ; and is in a more singular manner said to be " most holy unto the Lord,* *Exod. xxx. 8, 10.* Hence it was that King Hezekiah† immediately brake to pieces the brazen serpent, as soon as he considered that the children of Israel burnt incense to it. And yet if we inquire into the use that is made of it in your Church, we shall find it offered not only to the saints, but even to their very images and relics.‡ *Vasquez§* ingenuously confesses, that the Israelites gave no other worship to the brazen serpent than what you give to your images at this day ; and that Hezekiah therefore commanded it to be broken in pieces, not that he thought the people adored it as a god, but because he saw such a divine worship paid to it. It is one of the chief things remarked by your own writers in the life of a great saint of your order,|| *St. Gerard*, bishop of Chanade in Hungary, whom you commemorate Sept. 24, that he caused a church to be built in Chanade, his episcopal see ; and in it " dedicated a chapel to the honour of the blessed Virgin, where having set up her statue, he every day offered incense to the figure, and took care by an ordinance which he made, that her altar should never be without fine odours upon it, which should continually smoke to her honour."

55. Now this being the undoubted practice of your Church, and such as you cannot deny to be contrary to the express command of God under the law ; insomuch that Cardinal Bellarmine,¶ freely confesses it would have been criminal in a Jew to have offered incense to any besides God only ; either you must evidently prove to us, that those acts which were then appropriate acts of divine worship are not so now, but remain indifferent to be paid to the creature, as well as the Creator ; or you must give us leave to conclude that you do in this attribute the honour to an image, which God has reserved as peculiar to himself ; and are by so doing, guilty of idolatry.

56. And thus have I dispatched the two things you called me, without any provocation of mine, to examine ; and which it may be you will now begin to think you might as well have let alone : I return to my Defence, in which I am next to consider, what you have to except against my third argument,

* *Exod. xxx. 8, 10.*

† *2 Kings xviii. 4.*

‡ *Bellarmin. de SS. Beatit. l. 1. p. 2026. c. 13. D. [vol. 2. p. 403. n. 13. ut supra.]*

§ *Vasquez in 3. vol. 1. q. 25. Disp. 104. Art. 3. c. 5. p. 735.*

|| *Vie des Sts. Calend. Ben. ad Sept. 24.*

¶ *Bellarmin. de Imag. SS. l. 2. c. 17. p. 2144. [vol. 2. p. 457. c. 17. ut supra.]*

which I brought to shew, that you do truly and properly adore the cross ; and that was from your Good-Friday service.

Reply.] To this you answer, "that you had here also shewn my *insincere tricks*, in adding and diminishing words, to make your Church speak as I would have it.* And you pronounce me once more a *calumniator*, for saying, that this proves that your Church does adore the cross, in the utmost propriety of the phrase."

57. *Answ.*] These are hard words ; but I have always observed, that men are most uneasy when truth touches them to the quick. If you are not yet sensible that it was indeed a pitiful cavil to pretend I had false translated your Service, by what I have offered in my former part from Monsieur Imbert's case, and who for opposing that interpretation of those words which I delivered, was used after the same manner that I have declared ; I am confident you are the only person even of your own Church, that needs to be convinced of it. In all the French translations of your Missal I have ever seen, it is rendered in the very words that I gave it, "Behold the wood of the cross ; come, let us adore it : " and particularly in that of Monsieur Voisin, approved by those of your Church, even to excess, you will find it in these express terms, "*Viola le bois de la croix, R. venez adorons LE.*"

58. In the Missal of Salisbury, the determination of that address to the cross, is undeniably evident. The priests uncover the cross and sing the whole Antiphone, "Behold the wood of the cross ; come, let us adore ; " to which the choir kneeling down, answer, "We adore thy *cross*, O Lord." And I cannot but observe, that when Jo. Ægidius, canon of Seville (of whom I have so often spoken) was forced to retract, as heretical, his denial of supreme divine worship to the cross ; Ludovicus de Paramo† tells us, that the Fathers of the Inquisition convicted him of his heresy, especially by this argument, taken from your Good-Friday Service ; *viz.* that the Church on that solemn day did truly and properly adore the cross, when it said, "We adore thy *cross*, O Lord."

59. And‡ this may by the way suffice to shew how falsely you expound even those words, not to signify the cross of Christ, but his passion. Which besides that it is foreign to the ceremony of worshipping the cross, which you are then

* *Reply.* p. 33.

† *Lud. de Par. de Orig. S. Inquis.* l. 2. tit. 3. 3. 8. n. 19.

‡ *Reply.* p. 37, 38.

about ; and not a little nonsense into the bargain ; is here interpreted, not only by me, but by the fathers of the Inquisition, of the cross, properly so called ; and whose authority I presume you will not care to despise. And now I shall leave it to any jury that you please,* to judge of my translation ; and what character you deserve for your little reflection upon me. And I do assure you withal, that I will never from henceforward so far distrust my reader's memory, as to say the same things again, though you should give me the same occasion.

60. For the other point ; that this does plainly shew, that your Church adores the cross in the utmost propriety of the phrase ; if you will allow those great men I before quoted to understand the sense of your Church in this point, then it is plain, that my assertion must stand good. You see they freely confess it ; nay, what is yet more, they pronounce you a heretic for denying it. As for your applying of this worship to our Saviour Christ ; if you mean thereby to signify that Christ only is worshipped in this ceremony, exclusive to the cross ; it is evidently false, seeing the whole action, as well as words, shew, that the cross is at least worshipped together with him ; or rather (to speak more precisely) Christ is worshipped together with the cross. Nor will Cardinal Bellarmine, to whom you direct me, stand you in any stead. For even he allows the cross to be improperly and accidentally worshipped with the same kind of worship that Christ himself is. And if you please to let me send you to another Cardinal,† and who being both a great schoolman himself, and Master of the Sacred Palace, may be presumed to know somewhat of your Church's sense ; he will tell you, that your Cardinal Bellarmine was too wary in his distinctions : and that he ought, without any of those softening limitations, freely to have asserted, that the cross was truly and properly to be worshipped with divine adoration. And that I think, is much the same with what I said, that you do worship the cross in the utmost propriety of the phrase.

61. But you have here two singular arguments to excuse this service from the charge of idolatry, and which ought not to be forgot. For,

Reply.] “First, St. Paul (you say) looked upon it to be

* Ibid. p. 38.

† Card. Capis. ib. ubi sup. at par. 16. p. 670.

no superstition to fall on our face in the assembly, and worship God,"* 1 Cor. xiv. 25.

Answ.] *Ergo* (ô *Lepidum Caput*!) If St. Paul may be judge, it is no idolatry in you to fall on your faces in the assembly, and worship the *cross*. What would T. G. have given to have met with such a consequence in his learned adversary? But indeed we needed not this proof to convince us (in that gentleman's phrase) that you never looked over Aristotle's threshold, however your ill genius has prompted you to become a controvertist.

62. Well, but if St. Paul will not do, yet at least you are sure the primitive Christians were on your side. And you prove it by an instance most fit to keep company with the foregoing argument. The case in short is this.

Reply.] "St. Athanasius† relates how some Jews in his time in the city of Berthus (Berytus) in Syria, used great indignities to a crucifix, which a Christian had accidentally left behind him, when he removed from his lodgings. And you desire your antagonist to answer you this question: whether I would have excused those Jews, because they did those actions to an inanimate being; or would not rather have interpreted heir intention, as passing from the cross to our blessed Saviour."

63. *Answ.*] This is indeed a most melting argument, and which, as I remember, set all the good Fathers of the second Council of Nice a crying. But, Sir, be not you too much affected with it, for I will venture to give you that consolation, which one of your brethren once did his congregation in France;‡ when having preached in a most tragical manner about the passion, not of a crucifix, but of our blessed Saviour himself, insomuch that the whole assembly was in tears at it; the good father bid them not weep, for that, after all, "it may be it was not true." For,

1st, As to the book which you cite for this goodly story, it is certain it was written above 420 years after Athanasius was in his grave, and is of no manner of credit among the learned.

2ndly, As to the story: it was invented in the time of Irene, when all the world was set upon making and finding out fables and miracles, for establishing the worship of images.

* Reply, p. 38.

† Ibid.

‡ De la conformité des merveilles anciens avec les moderns, Par. 1. ch. 25. p. 389.

3rdly, All the authority we have, that ever there was any such thing done, and that it was not a mere invention (as were many others of the like kind at that time), is that of Sigebert, whose Chronicle, besides that it was written yet another 400 years after this supposed insult upon the crucifix,* was also an author whom Bellarmine himself confesses, is not to be credited in every thing he says. And especially when in all probability he had no other warrant for it than the Acts of the Council of Nice, and the pretended treatise of St. Athanasius, which you quote for it. So unlucky a thing is it for you to meddle with Church history.

64. But whether the relation be truth or fable, the question is put and must be answered: would I not have thought that these Jews hereby intended to affront our Saviour Christ? I answer, Yes: no doubt they did. And "why then (say you) I should not in like manner interpret this service of yours to terminate not upon the crucifix, but to tend to him who suffered upon the cross?" I answer, 1. That had you put your question as you ought, you should have asked, Why then we do not look upon your intention to be to honour, not the cross, but him that suffered upon it. Now there is a very great difference between these two. And however your friend T. G. supposes, that actions must necessarily go whither they are intended, yet I think both he and you ought by this time to be satisfied of the falseness of that maxim. And therefore should we allow your intention to be only to worship Christ, and not the cross, yet it does not thence follow that all your worship must by the interpretation of God's law terminate upon him. But now, 2. I have shewn, that for all your pretences, it is not your intention that your worship should so terminate upon Christ, as not to terminate also upon the cross together with him. 3. If it were, yet for all your intention you would nevertheless be far from honouring Christ: seeing that to worship Christ by an image is a prohibited act, and God cannot be honoured in the very same act in which he is disobeyed. And though an intention to dishonour Christ, by abusing his image, is sufficient to do it (as in all other cases one ill circumstance will make the whole action to be evil), yet a good intention alone is not sufficient to make an act good, nor by consequence for the glory of God, unless that intention itself be also governed by the rules of his commandments. For otherwise a man might do the worst things with a good intention, and that should be sufficient to

* Bell. de Scrip. Eccles. p. 283.

sanctify all his villanies. So far have you hitherto been from producing the least shadow of an answer to overthrow the force of my allegations. My last instance was,

65. Fourthly, From the Hymns of your Church.* In which I shewed that you address yourselves to the cross, and beg spiritual graces of it: and that you could not say the cross was here put by a figure to signify Christ crucified upon it; because the very words of the hymns shew, that it is the material cross, as distinguished from Christ, of which they speak.

66. And here you are in a great distress; you catch at everything that comes near you; but for the most part without considering whether it be to any purpose or no. As for instance: you observe, first, that I am brisk and confident, and have a mind to "expose your literature as well as your idolatry." But, Sir, may I beg leave to ask you on this occasion the very same question that you do me.† Who is it you mean, when you say I have a mind to expose *your* literature? If you understand that of your party, I must tell you I am so far from exposing it, that I shall presently shew you that they are the most learned men of your Church whom I follow in the application of that hymn I alleged. But if by *your* literature you meant your own, you have then made a most unlucky piece of work of it in joining your literature and your Church's idolatry together; and I doubt your brethren will have but little cause to applaud the comparison. For do but grant it to be as easy to prove the one as it is to expose the other, and I will never desire a fairer advantage against both than you have here offered to me. For,

67. Secondly, You say I must confess that your Church's hymns were made by poets, unless I will be so great a hypocrite as to deny that Prudentius and Fortunatus were poets. I suppose Prudentius and Fortunatus clubbed together to make the hymn that I refer to: only the mischief is, that the one lived in the end of the fourth, the other not till about the middle of the fifth century. Nay, but what now if neither of these were author of that hymn? I am sure Gretser, a very inquisitive man in these matters, speaks very doubtfully of it, and leaves it in question whether Venantius Fortunatus,‡ or Theodulphus, bishop of Orleans, was the author of it; and he lived yet later,

* Reply, p. 39.

+ Ib. p. 40.

‡ Lib. 1. de Cruce, c. 35.

about the beginning of the ninth century. But to let this pass ; and consider,

68. Thirdly, How you prove these men to be poets, and indeed it is very remarkable. You tell me, that if I will but look into the *Corpus Poetarum* I shall find them to have had a place among the poets. A most undoubted way this to find out whether an author were a poet or a schoolman ; and I dare say you were beholden to no man's literature but your own for this remark.

69. Well, but to grant that which I perceive you do not know very well how to go about to prove, that the author of this hymn, whoever he was, was a poet : what will follow ? Why then you say, fourthly, I shall presently find the figure he there uses ; his title being not "of the *cross*, but of the *passion* of our Lord." And then you take a great deal of pains to prove, what no man ever denied, "that the cross in holy Scripture is oftentimes put to signify the force, effects, and merits of Christ's death and passion." Now if this be anything to the purpose, as all that drops from a person of your literature must be supposed to be, then I must conclude, that seeing the title of that hymn is, "Of the Passion of our Lord," wherever I meet the word *cross* in it, I am to understand it not of the material cross, but of Christ's passion. This you must mean, or else all this ado is mere reverie and impertinence. Now then let us see what mad work we shall, according to this new exposition, make of that hymn.

"The *passion* of our King comes forth ; the mystery of the *passion* shines ; upon which *passion* the Maker of our flesh was hanged in the flesh.

"Beautiful and bright *passion* ! Adorned with the purple of a king. Chosen of a fit stock to touch such sacred members.

"Blessed *passion* ! upon whose arms the Price of the world hung. Hail, O *passion* ! our only hope ; in this time of the *passion*, increase righteousness in the godly, and give pardon to the guilty."

70. Now this I am confident a man of so much literature as you are, will not allow to be a proper paraphrase of this hymn : and if instead of the passion you put Christ for the cross, this will yet more increase the nonsense and confusion. In short, if all the *Corpus Poetarum* were alive, and should lay their heads together with you, they could not find out any of their figures that would do the business ; but must have some

new ecclesiastical figure found out to make the cross signify Christ and his passion, at the same time and in the same place in which it distinguishes both from the cross. And such a figure I do say would be as great a mystery in verse, as transubstantiation is in prose. And I desire you, if you can, to give me but one parallel text of Scripture, in which the cross is at once taken both literally for that cross on which Christ suffered, and figuratively, for Christ and his sufferings upon it.

71. In the meantime it shall suffice me once more to mind you of what I perceive you have nothing to say to, *viz.* that Aquinas and his followers, who have been sometimes reckoned men of literature in your Church, have understood this hymn according to the plain and literal meaning of it; and that so confidently as to conclude from it, that your Church holds divine honour to be due to the cross. "We ought to worship the images themselves (says Soto) for the Church doth not say, We worship *thee*, O Christ; but, We adore thy *cross*, O Christ. And again, *O crux ave*, &c. We direct our words and signs of adoration to the images (says Catharine), to which likewise we burn incense: as when we say to the *cross*, O *crux ave*." And to the same purpose, Marsilius ab Ingen, Ludovicus de Paramo, Philippus Gamachæus, &c. See Dr. Stillingfleet's Answer to T. G., part 2.

72. But if all this will not yet satisfy you, but you are still resolved to adhere to your new figure, I will then give you another instance, and which I believe may be prose, for I do not remember I ever saw it in the *Corpus Poetarum*, though this I shall leave to your literature to determine: and I pray be pleased to send us the paraphrase of this Antiphone, according to your new method of expounding:—

"O *cross*! brighter than all the stars; famous in the world; exceeding amiable to men; more holy than all things;* which alone hast been thought worthy to bear the weight of the world. Sweet wood! bearing the sweet nails and sweet burdens; *save* the present company gathered together this day to *thy praise*."

And this may serve for the second point, which was to make good the charge I had brought against you, of giving divine worship to images. I proceed now finally to shew:—

* Soto de Just. et Jure, l. 2. q. 3. Art. 2. Cathar. de Cult. et Ador. Imag. p. 133.

† Breviar. Rom. May 3. p. 797. Paris, 1643.

SECT. III.

That the Church of Rome thus worshipping of Images is truly and properly guilty of Idolatry.

73. There is nothing in all our disputes with those of the Church of Rome, that seems so much to offend them as this charge. They think it not only unreasonable to suppose that men in the clear light of Christianity should be capable of falling into idolatry, but even destructive of the very nature of a Church, and by consequence contrary to all those promises of Christ in his Gospel, "that the gates of hell should never prevail against it:" and indeed, were our notion of idolatry the same with what some of their late advocates have set forth as the true and only notion of it,* I should not at all wonder at their resentments; but rather confess that we had justly deserved all those reproaches which their intemperate pens have of late bestowed upon us.

74. But whatever their opinion of the true and only notion of idolatry be, yet common equity should have taught them to confess, that we mean no more in our charge of it against them, than this, that those of the Church of Rome, in their worship of the host, of saints and images, do give that honour to the creature, which ought to be given only to God. We do not pretend that you have either renounced the worship of the Supreme Deity; or that you do adore either the sun, moon and stars; or even angels and saints as such. And therefore howsoever you may dislike our notion of idolatry, yet you ought not to revile us for fixing a false charge against you, but to shew that we give an ill name to a true charge. And because I now desire not to be misunderstood, I do first of all declare, that by my present conclusion I intend no more than this, "that you do give the proper acts of divine worship to images, as I have already shewed you do to saints; and that this is truly and properly idolatry."

75. To discharge therefore this last part of my undertaking as I ought to do; I will proceed distinctly upon these two things.

I. To fix our notion of idolatry, against those new ideas that have of late been given of it.

II. To shew, that according to the true notion of it, the Church of Rome in her worship of images is guilty of idolatry.

* Reasons for abrogating the Test, p. 80, 81.

FIRST POINT.

I. Of the true nature of idolatry.

76. This is what you desire me to reflect upon,* and I hope it will not be thought amiss if I here with all imaginable tenderness communicate my reflections to you.

Reply, p. 28.] “Three things (you say) there are required to make that honour which we do pay to any thing, become idolatrous. First, The understanding must acknowledge an excellency in the object truly divine, and worthy of adoration in the strictest sense, where really there is no such excellency. Secondly, The will must have a propension and inclination to it as such, and pay that honour to it. And, lastly, The body must pay the exterior obeisance of bowing, kneeling, prostrating, kissing, &c. in pursuance of this interior love and knowledge.”

77. *Answ.*] That is to say, that no one is an idolater, but what takes somewhat to be god that indeed is not so, and upon that account gives the worship due to the Supreme God to a created being. And this explains what you had said before; “that you wonder how it could enter into the minds of men of common sense to conceive it possible, that in the clear light of Christianity, where all persons are taught there is but one God, to whom adoration is only due, they should yet fall down and adore a stock or a stone, and pay divine honour to it.”† That the idolatry of the ancient Jews and Heathens consisted in believing a plurality of gods, and adoring them as such:‡ so that, in short, let men but keep to the knowledge of the one true God, and not worship saints, or images, as such; and then there is no danger of idolatry for any other worship that may be paid to them.

78. And now let idolatry be as stabbing and cut-throat a word as it will;§ be its punishments, if it were possible, greater than what a reverend author has lately told us is its least, death and damnation; if this be the only idolatry, *viz.* to worship somewhat else besides God, as supposing it to be very God, I dare confidently affirm in behalf of all those popular divines that have ever used that scolding word, that the Church of Rome is not idolatrous in the worship of saints or images, nor has it in this sense ever been charged by us as such. But to shew the vanity of this pretence; and yet more

* *Reply*, p. 29.

† *Reply*, p. 27.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 28.

§ Reasons for abrogating the Test, p. 71, &c.

clearly express what we mean by this charge, I will now very plainly examine these two things :

I. Whether, according to the Scripture notion of idolatry, those may not be guilty of it, who yet both know and worship the one true God ?

II. How such persons may become guilty of it ?

I. Whether, according to the Scripture notion of idolatry, those may not be guilty of it, who yet both know and worship the one true God ?

79. And here it is not my design to enter on any large discourse about the general nature of idolatry ; but still remembering the particular point before me, to prove it only in such instances as are more immediately applicable to it. And such are especially these two.

First, The idolatry of the golden calf.

Secondly, Of the calves of Dan and Bethel.

80. As to the former of these, it has of late been suggested, that it was made by Aaron as the symbol of the Egyptian Apis or Osiris ;* and to whose idolatry the Israelites now returned in the worship of it. But this is indeed a very weak suggestion ; and whosoever will but consider the circumstances of what was done by that people on this occasion, will presently see, that they designed that calf to be the symbol, not of any Egyptian deity, but of the true God, whom accordingly they worshipped in the presence of it. And this will appear :

81. First, From the occasion of this idolatry, which was not any infidelity as to the true God, or that they had now any better reasons given them for the worship of others besides him ; but because Moses delayed to come down from the mount, therefore they urged Aaron to make them a god that might go before them.† They had now rested a long time in that place, and were impatient to go on towards the Land of Promise. But having now no Moses to inquire of God's pleasure, they wanted an oracle to consult upon these occasions. And therefore they cried out unto Aaron, "Up, make us gods that shall go before us ; for as for this Moses, the man that brought us up out of the land of Egypt, we wot not what is become of him."

82. Now that this was all they intended by it, will appear, secondly, From the character which the people presently gave to the calf, as soon as it was made. "This is thy God,"

* Reasons for abrogating the Test, p. 85.

† Exod. xxxii.

or as the Chaldee paraphrast renders it, "This is thy Fear, O Israel, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt."* For sure the people were not so stupid as to think it was either that image which had brought them up out of Egypt; or that the gods of Egypt had plagued their own people for their sakes, and with a high hand delivered them out of their power. No, doubtless they understood by it their God, who but just before at the delivery of the law, had assumed this as his own peculiar character, "I am the *Lord* thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage."† And this naturally suggests to me a third evidence of this truth:

83. From the title which Aaron himself gave to that God, of which this calf was the symbol, ver. 5, "And when Aaron saw it, he built an altar before it; and Aaron made proclamation and said, To-morrow is a feast unto the *Lord*."‡ This was the peculiar and incommunicable name of the God of Israel, which he assumed unto himself, Exod. vi. 2, when he renewed his covenant with them; and we do not find any one place in all the holy Scripture, where it has ever been attributed to any other.

84. Fourthly, Had the people hereby designed this to be the symbol of the Egyptian deities, how comes it to pass, that (as we read in the next verse) "they offered burnt-offerings and peace-offerings unto it?"§ for this, the Scripture tells us, "was an abomination unto the Egyptians;" and a late advocate for you freely confesses, that they esteemed bullocks and rams to be sacred animals, and therefore never offered any of them to their gods.||

85. Lastly, The Scripture plainly distinguishes this idolatry from that of the Egyptians, and makes the one to have been the punishment of the other. It is confessed, or rather contended for by the author I but now mentioned, that the Egyptian idolatry consisted in worshipping the sun, moon, and stars, as the supreme Deity. Now this St. Stephen tells us, that God afterwards permitted them to fall into, and therefore it must have been some other idolatry which in this case they were guilty of; for speaking of their setting up the golden calf, Acts vii. 41, he thus goes on, ver. 42, "Then God turned, and gave them up to worship the host of heaven."

86. As for the other instance I proposed to consider: The

* Ibid. ver. 4.

† Exod. xx.

‡ Ibid. ver. 5.

§ Ver. 6.

|| Reasons for abrogating the Test, p. 114, &c.

calves of Dan and Bethel; the occasion of their making was this. When the ten tribes had thrown off Rehoboam from being their king, and had chosen Jeroboam to reign over them; this new usurper, fearing lest if the people went up at the yearly sacrifices to Jerusalem, where Rehoboam still reigned over the other two tribes, it might in time occasion their falling away from him, set up two calves in Dan and Bethel, and made altars before them, and persuaded the people, saying, "It is too much for you to go up to Jerusalem: behold thy gods, O Israel, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt."*

87. Now that Jeroboam intended these calves to be symbols of the God of Israel, appears, first, from most of those reflections I before made. He gives them the same character by which they constantly understood the God of Israel; "Behold (says he) thy gods, that brought thee up out of the land of Egypt." He offered sacrifices before them, and consecrated the priests that ministered unto them, with a young bullock and seven rams.† All which is exactly agreeable to what God required of them, but was utterly inconsistent with the idolatry of Egypt. But,

88. Secondly, We have some more peculiar proofs of this matter. I speak not now of the readiness of the people in complying with him, which is not imaginable they would so easily have done, had he intended to lead them to the worship of strange gods. Nor will I insist upon the danger which so sudden an innovation might have brought to this new king, and who was not so little a politician, as to attempt such an alteration at a time when he was hardly yet well established in his new usurpation. These are indeed great probabilities, but such as this cause needs not; seeing it has the evidence of holy Scripture fully confirming it; it being certain that the idolatry of these calves did not take them off from the service of the true God. Let us examine all along the history of the kings of Israel; we shall find them constantly worshipping the Jehovah, the God of Israel. Jehu was zealous for him; he destroyed the idolatry of Baal out of his concern for the Lord; and had the kingdom by God's own immediate promise settled upon his posterity for his so doing. And yet it is expressly said of him, "Howbeit from the sins of Jeroboam, who made Israel to sin, Jehu departed

* 1 Kings xii. 28.

† 2 Chron. xiii. 9.

not from after them," *viz.* the golden calves that were in Bethel, and that were in Dan.*

89. Who was it but the true God for whom Elijah appeared so zealous? 1 Kings xviii. when he entered into that famous trial with the prophets of Baal; "If the Lord be God, follow him; but if Baal, then follow him." And the fire came down from heaven, and burnt up the sacrifice, and all the people confessed, saying, "The Lord he is the God; the Lord he is the God."†

90. Hence it is, that when Ahab fell into that other kind of idolatry which consists in worshipping of false gods, he is represented as much more heinously offending God, than the other kings of Israel, who worshipped the calves of Dan and Bethel,‡ 1 Kings xvi. 31, "And it came to pass, as if it had been a light thing for him to walk in the sins of Jeroboam the son of Nebat, that he went and served Baal, and worshipped him."

91. By all which it undoubtedly appears, that in both these cases, they designed by those calves to worship the true God; and then seeing it is confessed they did commit idolatry in that service, it must remain that men may know and serve the true God, and yet by worshipping him in this prohibited manner, may, in the interpretation of the divine law, commit idolatry.

92. I shall conclude this with that confession which the evidence of truth in this matter has extorted from Cardinal Bellarmine, and some others of your own communion; where, answering this objection, that when the golden calf was set up, Aaron proclaimed a feast, not to any other strange god, but ליהוה to the Lord, to the Jehovah, "It is (says he) the solution of Abulensis,§ and others, that there were two sorts of idols among the Hebrews. One without the name of any certain god, as that of Micah, Judges xvii. and perhaps the golden calf which Aaron made, Exod. xxxii. and Jeroboam renewed, 1 Kings xii.; for the Scripture does not call the calf the god Moloch, or the god Baal, but always says, These are *thy gods*, O Israel. The other sort of idols had a certain name; as Baal, Moloch, Ashtoreth, Chamos, &c. as is plain, 1 Kings xi. &c. They say, therefore, and that not improbably, that it may be admitted of the former kind, that the Jews did think that in the idol, *they worshipped the true God.*"

* 2 Kings x. 29.

† Ibid. 39.

‡ 1 Kings xvi. 31.

§ Bellarm. lib. 2. de Imag. c. 13. p. 2130, 2131. [vol. 2. cap. 13. n. 10. p. 451. ut supra]

93. And now though this might suffice to shew how consistent the guilt of idolatry is with the acknowledgment of one true God, yet will I add a reflection or two more, for the farther confirmation of it. For, first, were such a notion as this of idolatry to be admitted, it would serve no less to excuse the heathens than those of the Church of Rome of the guilt of it, for however they worshipped other inferior deities, as these do saints and angels, with a lower degree of religious honour; yet even they too acknowledged one supreme God, who was over all, and to whom the highest worship and adoration alone was due. This has been so largely proved by T. G.'s worthy and learned antagonist,* not to mention any others who have occasionally treated of this argument, that I shall not need to enter on any particular induction in order to the asserting of it.

94. Secondly, It cannot be questioned but that this new notion of idolatry, set up on purpose to excuse you from that imputation, is utterly repugnant to the principles of the ancient Fathers, who certainly charged those with idolatry, who yet believed and worshipped the very same God with themselves. Thus St. Athanasius† charges the Arians with idolatry for adoring Christ, whom they esteemed to be a creature. He tells them, "that no supposition of any excellencies whatever in him, although derived from God, would excuse them. But that if they thought him a mere man, and yet adored him, they would be found worshippers of men for all that." Nay, he doubts not to parallel them with the Gentiles,‡ and to compare the service they paid to our Saviour upon this supposition, with that which the other gave to their inferior deities. And the same was the opinion of all the rest of those great men, Gregory Nazianzen, Nyssen, Epiphanius, &c. and whose words are so well known, that I shall not need to transcribe them.

95. But now that I have mentioned Epiphanius, I may not forget another sort of idolatry exploded by him, and yet more near our purpose than the foregoing. I mean that worship which some superstitious women in his time paid to the blessed Virgin by offering a cake to her. Now this that holy Father condemns as downright idolatry, and the device of the devil. And to shew how consistent the charge of idolatry is with the worship of one God, he gives us a similitude that would almost imply a necessity of acknowledging the one true God to com-

* Defence of the Discourse of Idolatry, par. 1.

† Athanas. contr. Arian. Orat. 1. p. 286. [Par. 1627.]

‡ Ibid. 287.

plete the nature of it: "Idolatry (says he) comes into the world through an adulterous inclination of the mind, which cannot be contented with one God alone: like an adulterous woman that is not satisfied with the chaste embraces of one husband, but wanders in her lust after many lovers." So possible did those ancient Fathers think it to be for men in the clear light of Christianity, and retaining the acknowledgment of the true God, nevertheless to commit idolatry.

96. I might add here the exhortations of the New Testament, where both St. Paul and St. John, among other cautions to the Christians of their times, place that of fleeing from idolatry; and this in such a manner, as evidently supposes them very capable of continuing in the profession of Christianity, and the knowledge and worship of God, and yet of falling into it. But I shall content myself, lastly, to close up this with the confessions of learned Romanists themselves, who have acknowledged idolatry to be consistent with the worship of the true God.

97. St. Thomas defines idolatry to be a sin,* "whereby the singularity of God's dominion is taken from him;" and Cardinal Cajetan,† in his Notes upon this same question, supposes that a Christian may commit idolatry, and yet to be so far from renouncing the true God, as not to violate any part of his faith in him. Gregory de Valentia‡ says it is idolatry, "whenever a man intends to apply to a creature, either by words or by actions, any estimation which is proper unto the Majesty of God, whether it be done directly or indirectly." Vasquez§ reckons those to be idolaters, who give to an image the service due to God; and defines an idol in general to be, whatsoever is worshipped as God, that is not truly so. Now all these either manifestly suppose the knowledge of the true God, or at least do not exclude it.

98. But what need I insist upon generals, seeing if we may believe those of your own communion, you are not only capable, for all your Christianity, of falling into idolatry; but in this very point of image-worship, are actually guilty of it. For,

1st, Cardinal Bellarmine,|| disputing against that which I have shewn by such a number of witnesses to be the true doc-

* 22dæ. q. 94. Ar. 3. resp. ad 2. [vol. 22. p. 396. col. 2. Venet. 1787.]

† Cajet. p. 340.

‡ Lib. 1. de Idol. [De Reb. Fidei Contr. Sect. 5. p. 6. Lut. Par. 1610.]

§ Vasquez in 3. t. 1. p. 721.

|| Bellarm. de Imag. SS. l. 2. c. 24. p. 2153. C. [vol. 2. n. 7. p. 461. ut supra.]

trine of your Church, *viz.* "that the image of Christ is to be worshipped with proper divine worship;" doubts not to say this is idolatry; and therefore argues in this manner against it: "That this worship is either given to the image for itself, or for the sake of another. If for itself, it is plainly *idolatry*; if for another, it is not proper divine worship, because the very nature of that is to be given for itself. Again, either the divine worship (says he) which is given to the image relatively for another, is the same with that which is given to God, or it is an inferior worship. If it be the same, then the creature is equally worshipped with God, which *certainly is idolatry*. For idolatry is not only when *God is forsaken*, and an idol worshipped, but when an idol is worshipped together with God. If it be an inferior worship, then it is not the proper divine worship."

99. So that now the point is reduced to a fair issue. Either we must pay the same adoration to the image that we do to the original, and then Cardinal Bellarmine pronounces us idolaters; or we must give it only an inferior honour, and then Cardinal Capisucchi, and the Inquisition, damn us as heretics. Nay, but there is idolatry committed, go which way you will. For Vasquez,* another learned Jesuit, and whose works have been no less approved than Cardinal Bellarmine's, tells us, "that if a man give inferior worship to an image, distinct from that which is given to the thing represented by it, he thereby incurs the guilt of *idolatry*, because he expresses his submission to a mere inanimate thing, that hath no kind of excellency to deserve it from him." And now seeing there is so much danger of idolatry, whatever the honour be that is given to images, I hope we may be the easier excused, if admonished by these confessions, and directed by God's commandments, we refuse to give them any honour at all. And thus much may be said to the first point, "that a man may be capable of falling into idolatry, though he continues both to know and worship the one true God." My next business is, 2ndly, To shew how this may be done by him.

100. I shall mention only two ways, and which I have already before insinuated; *viz.*

1. By worshipping the true God after an idolatrous manner.
2. By giving divine worship to any other besides him.
1. By worshipping the true God after an idolatrous manner.

* In. 3. t. 1. p. 778.

101. This was the case of the Israelites, in the examples I have before mentioned, of the calves of Aaron and Jeroboam. They directed their adoration to the Jehovah, the Lord their God that brought them up out of the land of Egypt. To him they proclaimed the feast, and offered burnt-offerings and sacrifices upon their altars. Yet because they set up a symbol of him, contrary to his command, and worshipped him after an idolatrous manner, they are expressly charged as idolaters in holy Scripture; and the worship that was intended by them to God, is represented as given to a molten image.

102. And the same was the case of that other image which Cardinal Bellarmine joins with these, *viz.* the teraphim of Micah, Judges xvii. That these were designed for the service of the true God is plain, seeing both his mother is said to have consecrated the silver of which they were made ליהוה to the Jehovah, ver. 3, and Micah himself hired a Levite of the Lord's to be his priest, ver. 10, 11. And he comforted himself upon this consideration, ver. 13, "Now know I that the Lord will do me good, seeing I have a Levite to my priest." And again, chap. xviii. 5: "The priest asked counsel of God," for some of the Danites that inquired of him, and God, or the Jehovah, gave them a true answer. It is supposed by some in favour of this Micah, that being a religious man, and the public service of God being very much obstructed by the miserable violence of those times, he made himself a little oratory, and placed in it all the furniture of the tabernacle, with these teraphim to resemble the cherubims of the ark, whose figure St. Jerome and others suppose them to have had. But whatever becomes of this fancy, that which I have to observe now is, that what the original Hebrew styles *teraphim*, the old vulgar Latin calls *idols*; and in that famous passage, 1 Sam. xv. 23, they are both joined in the same rank of illness with one another: "For rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft; and to transgress an idol and a teraphim:" ἀνομία τῶν εἰδόλων, so Symmachus renders it; and so both the תרפים and תרפים in that place must undoubtedly be understood. And indeed Cardinal Cajetan* himself confesses as to the very point before us, that the whole work (however Micah intended it) was in God's estimation without question idolatry: and to whose opinion we have already seen Cardinal Bellarmine to have agreed; not to mention Tostatus and others, whom he refers to as acknowledging the same likewise.

* Comm. Jud. 17. verse 2.

103. 2ndly, As for the other way by which a man may commit idolatry, who yet both acknowledges and worships the true God, *viz.* by giving divine worship to any other together with him: I have already offered instances of that in the cases of the Arians and Collyridians; the one of which for worshipping Christ, whom they supposed to be but a creature; the other for offering a cake to the Virgin Mary, are charged by the ancient Fathers as guilty of idolatry. Nor is this without foundation from the holy Scripture. For besides, that first of all we find there all religious worship appropriated to God only, and therefore to give such worship to any other, must be practically to set up another god. To say nothing, 2ndly, that if any such worship has at any time been offered any holy men or angels, they have not only constantly refused it as a great abomination, but have still given this reason for it, that they were creatures, and by consequence not to be adored: "Stand up (says St. Peter to Cornelius), for I also am a man."* "Sirs, why do ye these things? (says St. Paul to the men of Lystra, who would have offered sacrifice to him) we are also men of like passions with you."† "See thou do it not (says the angel to St. John), for I am thy fellow servant: worship God."‡ All which sufficiently shew, that to worship any other besides God is to raise them above the state of creatures, and in effect to make idols of them. We may observe, 3rdly, that to give even the least part of that service which is due only to God, to any creature, is expressly called idolatry. Thus because we ought to trust in God only: covetous men who (as St. Paul tells them) trust in uncertain riches, are in the New Testament called idolaters.§ And sure those do not less deserve this character who trust in the blessed Virgin Mary and the saints, or by any other act of proper religious worship, such as prayer, and, in one word, all those other instances of religious adoration I have heretofore mentioned, shew that they divide the proper service of God with them.

104. Let us add to this, 4thly, that Cardinal Bellarmine || himself confesses that idolatry is committed, not only when God is forsaken and an idol worshipped, but when an idol is worshipped together with him. And this he proves from Exod. xx. 23, "Ye shall not make *with me* gods of silver," &c. וְאִתִּי *i. e.* says your learned Vatablus, ¶ to worship them to-

* Acts x. 26.

† Acts xiv. 15.

‡ Rev. xxii. 9.

§ Colos. iii. 5. Ephes. v. 5.

|| Bellarm. L. C. §. 98. *supr.*

¶ Vatabl. in Loc. [Biblia Heb. Gr. Lat. vol. 1. p. 165. ed. 1599.]

gether with me: for I will that you should worship *me alone*, and not join any companion *with me*.

105. I shall finish this with the consideration of that charge which St. Paul brings against the Gnostic heretics, and in which he plainly argues against their idolatry, Rom. i. 25, "that they changed the truth of God into a lie," *i. e.* says Theodoret, they gave the name of God to an idol, and worshipped or served the creature *παρὰ τὸν κτίσαντα* besides, but yet together with the Creator, who is blessed for ever, Amen. "For whereas (says the same Father) they ought to have worshipped the true God, they gave divine worship to the creature; to the same accusation are they subject, who calling the only begotten Son of God a creature, do yet worship him as God. For they ought in their divinity either not to rank him among the creatures, but with God that begat him, or if they will have him to be a creature, they ought not to give worship to him as a deity."

106. Hence Athanasius calls this "the folly of the Arians and Greeks: to worship the creature besides or with the Creator." And again, "the Apostle (says he) accuses the Greeks that they worshipped the creatures, seeing that they served the creature besides the Creator: seeing then the Arians say that our Lord is a creature, and serve him as such, wherein do they differ from the Greeks or Gentiles?" And, lastly, St. Jerome, in answer to the charge of Vigilantius, who accused them of idolatry for worshipping the relics of the martyrs, utterly renounces the charge upon the same foundation: "But as for us (says he) so far are we from adoring the relics of the martyrs, that we do not worship the sun or the moon, not any angels or archangels, not the cherubim nor seraphim, nor any name that is named either in this world or in that to come, lest we should serve the creature rather than the Creator, who is blessed for ever."†

107. And thus have I endeavoured in as short a compass as I could, to clear the general notion of idolatry, as far as concerned the point before me, and in which I suppose you to have erred more for your Church's sake, than for any great difficulty there is in understanding the nature of this sin. It will now be an easy task from these principles to infer (which is my next point),

* Tom. 1. p. 385. C.

† Hieronym. Epist. ad Ripar. tom. 3. Erasm. fol. 54. [Basil. 1516.]

II. That your Church in the worship of images is truly and properly guilty of it.

And this I shall shew according to what you desire :

1st, With reference to those who hold that images are to be worshipped with the same worship as the things which they represent.

2ndly, As it concerns their opinion, who, denying this, yet allow an inferior honour to them.

1st, That they are guilty of idolatry who worship images with the same honour as the things which they represent.

108. Where, first, I must observe, that this, however of late opposed by you and the rest of our new Representatives, is yet not only the most generally received doctrine of the Roman Church, but so esteemed to be the sense of your two Councils of Nice and Trent, that Cardinal Capisucchi produces a long catalogue of your greatest writers who have looked upon it as savouring of heresy to oppose it. And not only Monsieur Imbert in France, but also Ægidius Magistralis, and the French gentleman, whose case I before represented, will assure you, that in the Inquisitions of Italy, Spain, and Portugal, it is somewhat more than a scholastic nicety, or a probable opinion, which may without danger be opposed by you. And therefore, though, to make good my promise, I shall also dispute this point with you too, upon your own principles ; yet I must needs declare that it is here I esteem myself truly to oppose the doctrine of your Church in this particular.

109. Now that they who hold this sort of image-worship are thereby guilty of idolatry, is so evident, that your own Cardinal Bellarmine could not forbear reproaching them with it : and whose words I will once more produce, not more for the authority than the weight of them ; where, maintaining this conclusion, " That images of themselves and properly are not to be worshipped with the same worship with which the Exemplar is worshipped," he thus argues against the contrary opinion : " Either that *latría*, or divine worship, which is given to the image for another, is the same with that worship which is paid to God, or it is some inferior honour : if it be the same, then the creature is equally worshipped with God himself, which is certainly idolatry ; for it is idolatry, not only to forsake God and worship an idol, but to worship an idol together with God. As it is written, Ye shall not make gods of gold or of silver together with me." Thus this great writer. And though I ought not to expect such free declarations from you, whose

business it is to dissemble, and soften, and accommodate things all you can, yet have you plainly enough insinuated the very same. For when you lay down this position, "That the image of our Saviour Christ, or the holy cross, is upon no account whatsoever be worshipped with divine worship, that worship being due only to God :"* all you have to say for the other opinion is, "that it *may*," nay, that is not enough, "it *may possibly* be defended," which is, I think, a tacit confession, that, to say the truth, you doubted it could not. It is true, you afterwards grow more confident, and improve your *possibly* into *easily* : "I say these expressions of the schools *may* be *easily* defended ;" but then you add, that it must be done by "interpreting them so as not to shock this first principle, that God alone is to be worshipped ; that is to say, by changing the conclusion ;" and whereas they say, "that the cross is to be worshipped together with Christ with divine worship ;" you give it the new turn, "that not the cross, but Christ in presence of the cross is to be worshipped with divine worship." For otherwise you had before told us, that the holy cross itself must upon no account whatsoever be worshipped with divine worship ;" and again, here, this first principle (say you) must not be shocked, "that God alone is to be adored with divine adoration."

110. It appears by this how uneasy you are in this case, and it is not a little confirmation to us of the security of our condition, to see that you whose concern it so much is to be very well assured of what you do, yet cannot agree among yourselves what honour is to be given to images. But one party thinks that cannot be maintained without idolatry, which the other declares must not be denied without heresy. As for the images of the blessed Virgin and the saints, that those commit idolatry who worship them with the same religious worship that they pay to the exemplars, will follow from what I have before said of your worshipping the blessed Virgin and saints themselves. For if it be idolatry to give religious worship to the prototypes, it must then be much more so to pay it to the images.

111. For your other images, those of our Saviour Christ and the holy Trinity, I shall need no other argument than that of Cardinal Bellarmine before-mentioned, to shew the worship of those too to be idolatry. It being evident that to give

* Reply, pref. p. 18.

divine adoration to any creature, that is, to worship any creature as God, is to make an idol of it, and therefore the service that is thereby paid to it must be idolatry. Now that this is the case of those who hold this opinion, if what I have already cited from them be not sufficient to shew, and especially where they declare (as we have seen) that not only Christ, but the image itself too is to terminate the divine worship which is paid to Christ by it; I am sure the reason which they bring to establish their conclusion will be more than enough to do it: *viz.* "that the same indivisible act is at once and indivisibly the worship both of the image, and of Christ represented by the image. And if the image of Christ be adored with the same indivisible adoration with which Christ is adored, that adoration must be the supreme divine adoration, seeing with such only Christ is to be adored."*

112. But how, then, does the Cardinal excuse this from being idolatry? He answers,† "that it is not idolatry, because the image, as an image, is in that respect Christ himself; for, in this respect (says he), the image of Christ is not considered *precisely* as it is a *creature*, but as it is a divine thing, and Christ himself by representation." And then he dogmatically concludes, "that it is not at all inconvenient that a *creature*, as it is a divine thing, and after a certain manner one with God,‡ should be honoured with the very same divine honour with which God himself is honoured." In short, he confesses that the images of Christ, upon the account of their being so, may be adored with the very same adoration that Christ himself is, and that, in such a respect, it is not at all inconvenient for the creature to have divine worship paid to it. He looks upon idolatry to be, then, only committed when the image is worshipped exclusively to God, but that it is none to worship God by an image, or to worship an image together with God. But yet, since he confesses that images, considered as images in their representative natures, are still but creatures, and to worship any creature with the worship due only to God (whatever the pretence be for the so doing), is, in effect, to set up another god, which must needs be idolatry, it will remain, that no pretence of scholastic niceties will be able to excuse this great man from Cardinal Bellarmine's censure of idolatry, seeing, as he truly tells us, "it is idolatry not only to forsake

* Card. Capis. de Cult. Im. qu. 2. par. 9. p. 650.

† Ibid. par. 18. p. 677.

‡ Ibid. 679.

God and worship an idol, but to worship an idol together with God." But all this will more evidently appear from the other consideration, in which I am to shew,

Secondly, That even those who deny this supreme divine honour to images, are yet guilty of idolatry in what they allow to them.

113. The truth is, the case of these men is, I think, rather more inexcusable than that of the other kind, because that (in St. Paul's words, Rom. i. 32), "knowing the judgment of God, that they which commit such things as these are worthy of death, they not only do the same, but, *συνευδοκοῦσι τοῖς πρᾶσσουσιν*, they assent to those who do them;" *συνηγροῦσι*, so Theophylact; they defend and patronize them; *ἔσχατος δὲ οὗτος ὁρος τῆς παρανομίας*, as Theodoret very well observes upon this place.

114. Now that this is truly indeed your case, appears, 1. In that, at the same time that you assert, in express terms, "that you do not worship images, God forbid! that the cross is, upon *no account whatsoever* to be worshipped with divine worship," you nevertheless comply with those others before mentioned, in all the most forbidden instances of divine adoration: you incense them, you carry them solemnly in processions, you consecrate them, for this very end, that they may be worshipped; you prostrate yourselves before them in the church of God, and in the time of prayer; you desire several graces to accrue to you by your serving of them, nay, you address your very prayers to them, which your own Aquinas makes use of to prove that a proper divine adoration is due to the cross, for, having laid down this conclusion, that the cross is to be adored with the same adoration that Christ himself is, he immediately subjoins, "And for this cause it is that we speak to the cross, and pray to it as to Christ himself;"* where you must observe (says Cardinal Cajetan in his notes on that passage), "that St. Thomas brings our speaking to the cross as an effect of the same adoration with which Christ is adored; for, because we speak to the cross as Christ, it is a sign that we recur to the cross as to Christ." By all which it appears, that you are in this matter *αὐτοκατάκριτοι*, or self-condemned: if you believe this worship to be lawful, and yet deny it, of hypocrisy towards us; if you think it to be idolatrous, and yet comply with it, of a great sin towards God.

* Aqu. 3. p. qu. 25. ar. 4. in Corp. [ut supra, vol. 24. p. 127. col. 2.]

115. And that which yet farther confirms me in this is, to consider what wretched evasions you make use of to excuse yourselves in these particulars. Can any thing be more pitiful than the expositions you have here offered of your consecrating of crosses, of your Good-Friday service, and of the hymns of your Church, which I had alleged as instances of that worship you give to images? Do not these plainly shew a desperate cause, and that you are but too sensible that your old practices are not to be reconciled with your new pretences?

116. If, while I am endeavouring to convince you of idolatry, I do by the way discover your insincerity, it is what I cannot help. But all the use I shall make at present of these remarks, shall be to observe, that even those among you who pretend the most to deny a divine worship of images, yet must allow such acts of it as these I have here recounted. Now that even this will involve you in this guilt, is evident from the Scripture notion of idolatry before established; for I desire you to tell me, if you can, what did those Israelites do, when they worshipped the golden calf, that you do not, at this day, practise in the very same manner? Was it, 1. that they worshipped God by an image? But if this be idolatry, you cannot deny but that you do the very same. Or was it, 2. that they did not refer their worship finally to God, but terminated their adoration upon the very image itself? Nay, but Aaron, in express terms, proclaimed a feast unto the Lord; and to whom can we suppose that they offered their burnt-offerings and their peace-offerings but to the same *Lord* to whom the feast itself was proclaimed?

117. To conclude: There is nothing in that whole history to make us doubt but that they designed that calf only as a symbol of the God of Israel; and their idolatry, by consequence, was no other than what the most moderate men of your Church must confess themselves to be guilty of, *viz.* "that, contrary to God's express command, you set up graven images as representations of our Saviour Christ and the holy Trinity, and worship the infinite and incomprehensible God in a figure made like unto a mortal man;" which God himself has warranted us by his holy word to call *idolatry*.

118. It remains, therefore, upon the whole, that either you must shew us to be mistaken in our notion of idolatry, or you will never be able to acquit yourselves of the charge of it; and when you have done this, we shall then only tell you, that you commit a sin in this service, that you violate God's holy law,

which forbids it ; but for the denomination of it, we shall leave it to you, whose sin it is, to give it what particular name you yourselves think fit.

Of Relics.

119. In the point of relics, you offer only two things in answer to all that I had said upon that subject,* *viz.*

Reply.] First, "That the whole of my discourse proceeded upon a verbal dispute, what we are to call that honour which you give to them, and which you deny to be properly worship. Secondly, You once more egregiously cavil about the translation of that part of the Council of Trent which concerns this subject, and deny that you seek to the sacred monuments or relics of the saints for the obtaining of *their* help and assistance."

120. *Answ.]* For answer to which pretences, because I as little love to prolong disputes,† at any time, as you do when you have no more to say in order to the carrying of them on, I will lay aside words, and bring the issue to the things themselves, and shew how miserably you have prevaricated in this point too, as well as in the foregoing, by proving,

I. That you do properly worship the relics of your saints.

II. That you do seek to them for help and assistance.

And, when this is done, I shall not need to say any thing to prove that you here also commit idolatry, seeing you allow the cases of images and relics to be the same ;‡ and the Council of Trent makes this to be the very difference between the heathens and them, and that by which they hope to escape the censure of idolatry, *viz.* "that they do not believe any divinity or virtue in images for which they ought to be worshipped, or that any thing is to be asked of them, or any trust to be put in them :"[§] though how truly they declare this, the account I have before given of your consecrating both of crosses and *Agnus Deis* will sufficiently shew.

I. That you do truly and properly worship the relics of your saints.

121. This is a point that, in any other age or country but ours, would have needed no proof ; and it is not the least argument of an innovating spirit in you, that no words or expressions are of any value with you as often as you are minded to give us what you call the Church's sense. Let your writers use never so many phrases to assure to us their opinions that

* Reply, p. 42, &c.

† Reply, *Ibid.*

‡ Reply, p. 44.

relics are to be worshipped, all this signifies nothing—they meant no more by it than an “honour or veneration due to the sacred remains of those saints who were once the temples of the living God, and not a worship or adoration taken in its strict sense.”* There is hardly an expression, that can signify a proper worship, which your own authors have not made use of to declare the service they thought due to them. “I *adore, worship*, embrace the relics of the saints,” said one in the second Council of Nice, and the whole assembly resolved (act. 4.), “that their bones, ashes, rags, blood, and sepulchres should be *adored*, only men should not offer sacrifice unto them.” Cardinal Baronius speaks of it as an honour done him by Pope Clement VIII.,† that, though most unworthy of so great an undertaking, he was yet sent by him to examine and *adore* the venerable body of St. Cecilia. And though the cautious Synod of Trent said only that relics should be venerated, yet, seeing it neither condemned the opinions of those who taught they were to be worshipped, but rather allowed the acts of proper divine service paid to them, what can we conclude, but that they made use of a loose expression to satisfy the more moderate party of your communion, at the same time that they resolved, by their practice, to favour the superstition of those who properly adored them?

122. Now, that this was truly the case, will appear,

First, From what I have before said concerning the holy cross, which is considered by you in a double capacity, both as an image and as a relic, and is, upon both accounts, delared to be worthy of the very *same adoration* that Christ himself is : and I hope that is a proper worship in the strictest sense ; for thus St. Thomas argues, “ If we speak of the very cross upon which Christ was crucified, it is to be worshipped with divine worship, both as it represents Christ, and as it touched the members of Christ, and was sprinkled with his blood ; and for this cause we both speak to the cross, and pray to it, as if it were Christ crucified upon it ;”‡ where note, says Cajetan,§ “ that our speaking to the cross is here produced as an effect of the same adoration with which Christ is adored.” This, I think, is plain enough, and may serve to shew, both with what sincerity you deny that, properly speaking, you do worship

* Reply, p. 42.

† Annal. ad Ann. 821. § 14. [vol. 14. p. 16. col. 2. Lut. 1743.]

‡ Aquin. 3 par. Qu. 25. Art. 4. [ut supra, p. 127. col. 1, 2.]

§ Cajet. in Th. Ibid.

relics, or that it is not the cross, but Christ crucified upon it, to whom you speak in these addresses, and which I have before vindicated against your cavils.

123. Now this is the more to be considered, in that here you cannot say, as you do in the case of images, that the figure and the proto-type are in a manner united together, and that therefore the image in its representative nature is in some sort very Christ. The reason of this worship being only a former relation to our Saviour; because (says Aquinas) it heretofore touched his sacred members, or was sprinkled with his blood.* Upon which single account, Cardinal Capisucchi doubts not to affirm, "That the wood of the cross is so sanctified and consecrated by Christ, that every the least particle of the cross divided from the whole, and from the other parts, does remain consecrated and sanctified; and therefore that every the least piece of the cross is to be adored with the very same supreme divine adoration that Christ himself is."† So truly have you told us, that you do not allow relics a worship or adoration taken in its strictest sense.‡

124. And what I have now said of the cross, will in the next place no less hold for the nails, lance, and other instruments of his passion. Upon which account, as we have seen that you address to the cross, so you also do to the lance: "Hail, O triumphant iron! Happy spear! Wound us with the love of him that was pierced by thee."§ It is possible you may find out this too in the *Corpus Poetarum*; and by the same figure that the cross signifies at once both the material cross, and our Saviour that hung upon it, may make the spear here signify at once both St. Longinus's spear, and the body of Christ that was wounded with it. And that you may see how much it will be worth the while to have such an ecclesiastical trope invented, I will add one instance more of another relic, that has an address made to it altogether as much wanting it as either of the foregoing. The relic I mean is the Veronica, or cloth with which our Saviour Christ wiped his face, and left the impression of his visage upon it. And to this you thus pray: "Hail, holy face of our Redeemer, printed upon a cloth white as snow; purge us from all spot of vice, and join us to the company of the blessed. Bring us to our country, O happy figure! there to see the pure face of Christ." This is, I suppose, a plain instance enough what kind

* Aquin. loc. cit.

† Paragr. Appendix. p. 690.

‡ Reply, p. 42.

§ Vid. Card. Capis. l. c.

of honour you pay to relics. And that this cloth might never want votaries to worship it, your pope John XXII., has vouchsafed no less than ten thousand days indulgence to every repetition of this prayer. I might add other instances of this kind of superstition. But I go on,

125. Thirdly, To another instance of your giving religious worship to relics; and that is your allowed practice of swearing by them. Now that to swear by another, is to give that thing by which you swear the worship due to God only; both the nature of an oath, which implies a calling of God to witness, and thereby acknowledges him to be the inspector of the heart, and the just avenger of the falsehood of it, and the authority of holy Scripture plainly declare; "Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God, says Moses, Deut. vi. 13, and shalt serve him only, and swear by his name." "How shall I be favourable unto thee? says God by the prophet Jeremy, chap. v. 9. Thy children have forsaken me, and sworn by those that are no gods." But now the Catechism of your late Synod of Trent allows you to swear by the cross, and relics of your saints;* and there is nothing more common among you than so to do. When the Emperor comes to Rome to take the imperial diadem at his Holiness's hands, he thus swears: "I King of the Romans *swear*—by the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; and by the wood of the cross, and by these relics of the saints, &c." In which we find the holy Trinity joined in the same rank with the wood of the cross, and with the relics of the saints.

126. Nor am I here concerned in those pretences that are sometimes brought to excuse this, *viz.* that you hereby intend no more than to swear by God, seeing it is plain that you do it at once both to God and them. And again: that you do not believe that thereby any strength is added to the oath which it would not otherwise have: for allowing this, yet still you do swear by them; and if there be neither any reason for it, nor benefit in it, you are never the less culpable, but the more inexcusably so upon this account. But indeed you do expect a benefit by this swearing; and suppose the saints do hereby become sureties with God to you to see the oath fulfilled, and to punish the perjury if it be not. And so you do not only swear by the relics as well as by God, but ascribe all the reason and design of an oath to the saints in

* In 2. præc. decal. p. 267. [p. 373. Mechlin. 1831.]

common with God. I will illustrate this in one of your own instances, which will clear this matter to us. It happened that one of your saintesses, St. Guria, was married to a Goth, a soldier in the Roman army, that was sent to deliver the city Edessa from the Huns. The siege being raised, and the army recalled, the soldier required his wife to go home with him. Her mother could not bear this; but being forced to comply, she brings the soldier and her daughter to an altar, under which were buried the bodies of three saints. And being there, she thus spake to him: "I will not give thee my daughter, unless, laying thy hand upon this tomb, in which are contained the relics of the holy martyrs of Christ, thou shalt swear that thou wilt treat my daughter well." This he readily did: but yet soon after, without any regard to his oath, he used her very ill. It were too long to recount all the circumstances of her misfortunes, or her miraculous deliverance out of them, by the aid of these holy martyrs. I observe only as to my present purpose, that being reduced to the utmost degree of despair, the saint now, as her last refuge, puts the holy martyrs in mind of her husband's swearing by their relics, and how they were thereby become *sureties* to her mother for her good entertainment, and ought not to suffer her to be thus abused. Immediately the martyrs spoke to her, and told her, that as *faithful sureties* they would deliver her; and straightway she was miraculously brought out of a coffin under ground (for her husband had buried her alive) to the very place where their bodies lay, and where her husband had sworn to her. And then they once more spoke to her to this effect: "We have now satisfied our *suretiship*, go to thy mother." It was not very long after this, that the war breaking out again, the same soldier came back to Edessa, where he was surprised to find his wife alive; and being prosecuted for the injuries he had done her, and for the perjury he had committed, was condemned to be hanged for it. But,

127. Fourthly, And to conclude this point. I will to these add those superstitions which are your common practice; and of which every one that has lived any time among you, must needs have been eye-witnesses. Such are your running to visit the shrines of your saints upon their solemn festivals; which with what devotion you do it, all Paris on the 3rd of January every year is sufficiently sensible. Your carrying them in procession is indeed very remarkable; and of which I shall leave those who have ever known a day time in the city

I last mentioned, to consider what they have then seen. But because I must not expect to be credited by some men in any thing that can possibly be denied; I will leave these matters of fact to those who have been spectators of them: and for the satisfaction of those who have not will give a short extract of the form of procession, with which you bring the relics of your saints into a new church.

128. "First, the bishop with his clergy leads the procession to the place where the *relics* were lodged the night before.* When they are come to it, they sing this anthem, 'Move yourselves, O ye saints of God, from your mansions, and hasten to the place which is prepared for you.' Then the bishop uncovering his head before the *relics*, prays thus: 'Grant unto us, O Lord, we beseech thee, that we may worthily touch the members of thy saints that are more especially dedicated unto thee.'

"Then the incense being prepared with the cross, and lighted candles leading the way, and followed by the clergy, singing their anthems, the priests appointed, take up the carriage, and one going by them all the way incenses the relics. The bishop and clergy singing, among others, this anthem, 'Rise up, ye saints, of God from your habitations; *sanctify the places; bless the people, and keep us sinful men in peace.*—Walk, O ye saints of God; enter into the city of the Lord, for a church is built unto you, where the people may adore the majesty of God.'

"Being come to the door of the church, they make a stop whilst some other ceremonies are performed. Then the bishop crosses the door with holy chrism, and bids it be blessed, and sanctified, and consecrated, and consigned, and commended, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. And so they carry in the relics, the bishop and clergy singing as before."

This is the order of that solemnity. What name it deserves I shall leave it to others to say. But sure I am, that all this is somewhat more than such an honour and respect which you pretend is all that you give to them. Let us see,

II. Whether you do not seek to these sacred monuments for help and assistance?

129. It is indeed a hard case that we must be forced now to prove that which is a known practice of daily experience

* Pontific. Roman. de Benedictione Ecclesie, p. 119, &c. [vol. 2. p. 85, &c. Rom. 1739.]

amongst you. The Council of Trent itself confesses, "That by them many benefits are bestowed by God upon men;" and then I am confident it will not be thought at all improbable, that it should encourage men to recur to them for their help. But here you have a notable evasion. "You do not deny but that men go to these sacred monuments and relics to receive benefit; but this you say will not justify my translation, unless when they come they pray to the relics instead of desiring the saints, whose they are, to pray for them."* And to make this look like a rational answer, you change the terms of the question; which was not (as you falsely insinuate) whether the Council of Trent directs you to *implore* the aid of the monuments or sacred relics;† but whether it does not condemn those who say that for the *obtaining* of their help, the memories of the saints are in vain frequented.‡ And though they do not *pray* to the relics; yet if for the *obtaining* of their help, your people do recur to them, which you cannot deny but that they do, the presumption offered in vindication of my rendering that passage of your Council is still good; and you have shewn nothing but your own falseness in this new answer to it. If it were necessary to prove that you do pray to relics, you may see, by what I have already offered, that even so you would not have secured yourself from having made yourself a false translation, where you charge me with one. But you have chosen your jury, and I accept of it; and only for their better direction, I must desire them to look out the words in the Council itself, and not in your transcript of them; who have purposely omitted all the antecedent to which the *eorum* refers; that so they might be sure to see no more than what made for your purpose. Should I have done this, I should have found all the variety of hard words mustered up against me, mutilation, falsification, false imposition, wilful prevarication, wilful mistake, unsincere trick, &c. that either your margin could have contained, or your malice have invented; and the truth is, I should have deserved them. But I shall leave this also to your jury to judge of; and for all your good assurance, I dare venture all my little learning, against all your little, that the verdict is brought in against you; and that you are concluded in this matter to have been either very blind, *Aut illud quod dicere nolo*.

130. For what concerns the thing itself; whether you do

* Full Answ. p. 6.

† Full Answ. *ibid*.

‡ See Expos. p. 17. Defence, p. 25.

not seek to the monuments of the saints for the obtaining the help of their relics; this is what will need no proof to those who are but never so little acquainted with your superstition: and have seen with what zeal you touch your beads and psalter at the very shrines in which they are contained, to sanctify them thereby. How upon all occasions they are brought forth by you: to cure your sickness; to preserve you from tempests at land, and in storms at sea; but especially to drive away evil spirits, for which they are the most beneficial. The Messieurs du Port Royal* have given us a whole volume of the miracles wrought by the holy Thorn. There you may see how Sister Margaret, one of the nuns, being ill of the palsy, was carried to *adore* the holy Thorn. How another being sick, recurred to it for its help, and found it too; having no sooner *adored* the holy Thorn, and kissed it, but she was well of her infirmity. Infinite examples of the like kind might be produced, but I shall content myself to shew what opinion you have of the power of your relics,† from the very prayer that you make at the blessing of those little vessels in which they are put.

“We most humbly beseech thee, Almighty God, Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, that thou wouldst vouchsafe to bless these vessels that are prepared for the honour of thy saints, through the intercession of the same saints: that all those who shall venerate their merits, and humbly embrace their relics (may be defended) against the devil and his angels, against thunder, lightning, and tempest; against the corruption of the air, and the plagues of men and of beasts; against thieves and robbers, and invasions of men, against evil beasts, and against all the several kinds of serpents and creeping things, and against the wicked devices of evil men.”

Here I hope are benefits enough to invite a man to seek to them, and if they can help in all these cases, we need not doubt but they shall have votaries enough to recur to them for it.

131. But that which is most admirable is, that in all these cases, false relics are every jot as good as true ones; and which makes somewhat for the opinion of Vasquez, that provided a man does but think it is the relic of a saint, he may securely worship it, though it may be it is no such thing. We

* Reponse à un Ecrit publié sur les Miracles de la Ste. Espine, p. 15, 18, 22.

† Pontific. Rom. p. 164, 165. [Ibid. p. 320.]

have before heard that mighty cures were wrought at the monument* of the famous bishop and martyr, *Viarum Curandarum* : and whether the Council of Trent prescribed it or no, Ressendius assures us, all the country round about did come to the monument of this pretended saint, for the obtaining help and assistance, and fancied at least that they found it too. Though it afterwards appeared that it was an old heathen inscription, and those words far enough from signifying either the name of a man, or the character of a bishop. Many have been the cheats of the like kind, and which ought very much to lessen the credit of those miracles that you pretend are wrought in your Church. But I shall finish all with one so much the more to be considered, in that it was the happy occasion of undeceiving a very great person, and disposed him to receive that truth he afterwards embraced : and may it please God, that the recital I shall here make of it, may move those who are yet in captivity to these superstitions, to deliver themselves from the like impositions.

132. Prince Christopher, of the family of the Dukes of Radzevil, a prince much addicted to the superstitions of your Church, having been in great piety at Rome to kiss his Holiness's feet ;† the Pope at his departure presented him with a box of relics, which at his return soon became very famous in all that country. Some months had hardly passed when certain monks came to him to acquaint him that there was a D. man possessed of the devil, upon whom they had in vain tried all their conjurations, and therefore they humbly entreated his Highness that for his relief he would be pleased to lend them his relics which he had brought from Rome. The prince readily complied with their desires, and the box was with great solemnity carried to the Church, and being applied to the body of him that was possessed, the devil presently went out with the grimaces and gestures usual on such occasions. All the beholders cried out, A miracle ! and the prince himself lifted up his hands and eyes to heaven, and blessed God who had favoured him with such a holy and powerful treasure.

It happened not long after that the prince relating what he had seen, and magnifying very much the virtue of his relics ; one of his gentlemen began to smile, and shew by his actions how little credit he gave to it. At which the prince being

* See above, art. 3.

† Drelingcourt Response à M. le Landgrave Ernest, p. 348. §. 40.

moved, his servant (after many promises of forgiveness) ingenuously told him, that in their return from Rome he had unhappily lost the box of relics, but for fear of being exposed to his anger, had caused another to be made as like as might be to the true one, which he had filled with all the little bones and other trinkets that he could meet with, and that this was the box that his monks made him believe did work such miracles.

The prince the next morning sent for the fathers, and inquired of them if they knew of any demoniac that had need of his relics : they soon found one to act his part in this farce ; and the prince caused him to be exorcised in his presence. But when all they could do would not prevail, the devil kept his position, he commanded the monks to withdraw, and delivered over the man to another kind of exorcists, some Tartars that belonged to his stable, to be well lashed till he should confess the cheat. The demoniac thought to have carried it off by horrible gestures and grimaces, but the Tartars understood none of those tricks, but by laying on their blows in good earnest, quickly moved the devil, without the help of either hard names, holy water, or relics, to confess the truth, and beg pardon of the prince.

As soon as morning was come, the prince sent again for the monks (who suspected nothing of what had passed) and brings their man before them, who threw himself at the prince's feet, and confessed that he was not possessed with the devil, nor ever had been in his life. The monks at first made light of it, and told the prince it was an artifice of the devil who spoke through the mouth of that man. But the prince calling for his Tartars to exorcise another devil, the father of lies, out of them too, they began presently to relent, and confessed the cheat, but told him they did it with a good intention to stop the course of heresy in that country.

Upon this he dismissed them, but from that time began seriously to apply himself to read the holy Scriptures, telling them that he would no longer trust his salvation to men who defended their religion by such pious frauds, so they called them, but which were indeed diabolical inventions. And in a short time after, both himself and his whole house made open profession of the Reformed religion. Anno 1564.

And thus much be said in answer to your fourth Article.

THE DIFFERENCE
BETWEEN THE
CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND THE CHURCH OF ROME.
IN
OPPOSITION TO A LATE BOOK
INTITULED,
“ AN AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND
AND THE CHURCH OF ROME.”

THE author of a book newly published, called, “The Agreement between the Church of England and Church of Rome,” saith, “There has of late been a great cry, that the clergy of the Church of England are now the chief, if not the only opposers of Popery, and defenders of the Protestant religion; * and therefore, to put a check to the insulting talk of our clergy (who would be thought the only champions against Popery) it is become necessary in the present juncture to emit such an essay as this, to shew an agreement between the Church of England and Rome, and that the controversy lies only between the Church of Rome and the Protestant Dissenter.” This I confess is an expedient of expedients, and as it is necessary for the relief of those who are so successfully beaten out of their late pleas of misrepresentation, that they sullenly declare, until that be yielded they will not dispute: so it may be necessary in this present juncture, † for the charming that adder, which has yet been deaf to all the arguments of flattery, interest, and fear; and to put an end to that answering, replying, rejoining, and sur-rejoining, which for some months, he saith, both sides have been employed in. For if there be an agreement in opinion between both Churches, there

* Preface to the Agreement

† Page 1.

will be no further occasion for disputing between them ; and if the only opposers of Popery, the clergy of the Church of England, are convinced of it, there will be no farther disputing nor opposition : since those between whom the controversy only lies, *viz.* the Church of Rome and Protestant Dissenter, are it seems upon terms of mutual cessation.

But now, lest those of the Church of England, that after all the complaints made against them for misrepresentation, will not grant any such thing properly, and in a strict sense (and it is likely not in any sense), should be as obstinate and hard to be convinced in this case : therefore, to put it out of dispute (if he be to be credited), he has with some clearness demonstrated the agreement of opinion between the Churches of England and Rome to be exact and full.* And if demonstration and clearness of demonstration, will not do it, nothing will. But it is some men's way to talk most of infallibility, self-evidence, and clearness of demonstration, when they are farthest from it ; and I began presently to suspect our author's credit, when I found him to shift his ground, as if he did distrust his own demonstrations.

As for instance,

1. He had no sooner begun to demonstrate this exact and full agreement of opinion, but by way of prevention, he declares, he would not encumber his discourse with a catalogue of agreements in the great doctrines of Christian religion, and matters of opinion,† but would confine himself to matters of government and worship, which chiefly concern men's practices. How ! demonstrate the agreement of opinion, and yet forbear meddling with matters of opinion ! to undertake it, and then to except the thing he undertakes ! And then to confine himself to matters of government and worship, as if there were not as much reason to shew an agreement in doctrine, as practice ; or that matters of government and worship were not also matters of doctrine !

2. When he seems to come to the point he confines himself to, *viz.* government and worship ; yet he fails again, for it is only in some parts of worship,‡ which he ventures to say that the agreement will be found exact and full. As one sensible, that though there is nothing in the Liturgy and Prayers of the Church of England (which he instances in) as to the matter of them, but what every Christian may allow,

* Preface.

† Page 2.

‡ Page 3.

and so what the Pope may as well as (he saith) did approve;* yet, that their Missal and Breviary contain such prayers to the saints, and for souls departed, &c. as can be by no other figure made to agree with the worship and prayers used in the Church of England, than one part of a contradiction can be reconciled to the other.

3. It is further worthy of our observation, that the agreement he pretends to prove is not from the avowed doctrine of either Church, but by some quotations he produces from two or three particular authors, on the part of the Church of England; and from such as on their own side, are rejected by the governing part of their Church;† so, for instance, he saith of the Church of England, they are the avowed principles of some of the clergy and late writers. And when he undertakes for the Romish Church he tells us, that a great, if not the greatest part, grant to the other but a primacy, for the sake of catholic concord, &c.‡ For proof of which, he appeals to the Councils of Constance and Basil, and the privileges of the Gallican Church. And yet the acts of those Councils were reprobated in succeeding Councils; and so far as concerns this case, were utterly disallowed,§ as Bellarmine saith. And of what little authority the Gallic privileges have been accounted at Rome, there needs no more evidence than the case of De Marca,|| as it is represented by this author. So that let his quotations¶ (which he pretends to be very just in) be admitted; yet his argument from thence, for an exact and full agreement, as to this matter, amounts to this only: some of the Church of England are for a primacy for concord's sake, and some of the Church of Rome are for no more: therefore the agreement between the Church of England and Rome is very exact and full in those points. And if this be his way of demonstration, it might to as good purpose be shewed, that there is also in several points, this kind of agreement between those that (he saith) the controversy only lies between, viz. the Church of Rome and the Protestant Dissenter.

4. When he offers at a demonstration from these particular authors, he attempts not to prove it so much from what they say, as from what he himself infers from it. So much he acknowledges; for when he had charged Dr. Sherlock to have found out a Divine institution for the Pope's primacy** (this

* Page 60.

† Preface.

‡ P. 16, 18, 30, 31.

§ De Concil. l. 1. c. 7.

|| Page 22, &c.

¶ Preface.

** Page 42, 43, 44.

being so gross as he could not father it upon him but he should soon be detected), he brings himself off with this : this, I confess, the Doctor doth not expressly carry any further than the combinations of a national church and primacy,—that is, he says no such thing.

5. When he doth find out some things in which the Churches are agreed, they are such things as the Church of England agrees with the ancient and most other Churches in, *viz.* Episcopacy and a Liturgy ; and it had been to the like purpose, if he had also shewed their agreement in the great doctrines of Christian religion. And yet, even here, he fails again ; for he that concludes, in a word,* “the agreement between the English clergy and the Romanist, about the immediate divine right of episcopacy, is so full,” &c. doth before acknowledge that “ordination by presbyters† is granted in the Church of Rome to be valid and regular, and that all those that hold the supreme jurisdiction of the Pope‡ over the whole Catholic Church visible, do hold the divine right of bishops to be but mediate (*mediante Papa.*)” So that he is gone from an agreement of Churches to an agreement between persons ; from a full agreement in opinion to an agreement in government and worship ; from worship to some parts of worship ; from demonstrations to inferences, and framed propositions of his own ; from an agreement at last to a disagreement.

And now we may look back with some comfort, to this bold offer, and clear demonstration at the beginning, when he saith, “The author has with some clearness demonstrated the agreement of opinion between the Church of England men, and the Church of Rome, to be so exact and full, that if the government should so design, it were but *dictum factum*, according to their doctrine ; and a Cassandrian peace might be patched up presently with Rome.”§

He advances, as if he were a kind of plenipotentiary ; but it may be suspected, he that has this way of demonstration, is not like to be very fortunate in the negotiation.

Thus much shall suffice for our author’s way of demonstration, and his attempt to shew the agreement between the Church of England, and Church of Rome ; leaving a fuller answer to some of his particular discourses to an abler pen.

* Page 44.

† Page 36, 37.

‡ Page 42.

§ Preface.

But yet there remains another part toward a just state of the controversy,* and that is (as he well observed) to let the world know how far these Churches differ, as well as wherein they are agreed : but that was a province he had no mind to prosecute ; as being, though more to the purpose, yet not so much to his design. For certainly, he that will demonstrate the agreement to be full and exact, must either suppose there is no difference ; or if there be, that the difference is not considerable enough to hinder the agreement. But if there be a difference, and the difference in points diametrically opposite and irreconcilable, it is to no purpose to shew their agreement (were it so) to be full and exact in others. And that this is the case, and the disagreement far greater than the agreement, I shall endeavour to prove, and that not from an author or two, or far-fetched consequences, and forced interpretations, and dubious expressions ; but from sufficient authorities, and the avowed principles of both Churches. Such are the Thirty-nine Articles, the Catechism, the Homilies and Liturgy of the Church of England. Such again are the Councils, more especially the Council of Trent,† the Catechism *ad Parochos*, the Rhemists' Annotations, the Missal and Breviaries: according to which, and the like, a Papist Represented (as the mode of speaking has been of late) doth believe.

In order to which I shall premise,

1. That there are some articles which both Churches do in express terms agree in, called by our author‡ the great doctrines of religion, *viz.* Art. 1. of the holy Trinity [and so, how Socinians can subscribe the Articles of the Church of England (as this author affirms),§ I understand not] ; Art. 2. of the Word or Son of God ; Art. 3. of the going down of Christ into hell ; Art. 4. of the Resurrection of Christ ; Art. 5. of the Holy Ghost ; Art. 7. of the Old Testament ; Art. 8. of the three Creeds ; Art. 12. of Good Works ; Art. 16. of Sin after Baptism ; Art. 18. of obtaining eternal Salvation only by the name of Christ ; Art. 23. of Ministering in the Congregation ; Art. 26. of the Unworthiness of Ministers ; Art. 27. of Baptism ; Art. 33. of Excommunicate Persons ; Art. 38. of Christian Men's goods ; Art. 39. of a Christian Man's Oath. Against these, the Jesuit Johan. Roberti,|| hath little or nothing

* Page 2. † A Papist Misrepresented and Represented, Introduct.

‡ Agreement, p. 1.

§ Page 2.

|| Ecclesiæ Angl. Basis Impostura, Luxemb. 1679.

to object in his small tract purposely written in opposition to our Articles.

But of these Articles it is to be observed, there are some which each party differs as much from the other in (when they come to explain themselves), as if there had been no agreement in terms. Thus it happens in Articles 3d, 7th, and 15th; as shall afterwards in part be shewed.

2. There are other Articles, wherein both Churches do agree in the sense, though they differ in terms; or that are not so much controversies between Church and Church, as between private doctors in each Church.* Of this opinion is a learned foreigner of the Reformed religion, about the matter contained in articles the 10th and 17th, of Free-Will; and of Predestination and Election. Of the former, he saith, "The difference that our adversaries will object between them and us, upon this point of Free-will, is only imaginary, and mere cavil." Of the latter, he concludes, "Since we agree in the fundamentals of this doctrine (as we have already set forth), and that our dissent is but with a few of their doctors, it would not be very hard (I should think) to find out such a bias of temperament, drawn from the word of God, in proposing of these opinions, and in terms so proportioned to their sublimity, as all humble and moderate spirits would find sufficient for their satisfaction."

3. There are other points which are matter of liberty, and left undetermined in the Church of England; and so she doth receive into her communion, as well those that deny, as affirm. But, on the contrary, the Church of Rome hath determined several points of this nature to be matters of faith; and anathematized those that do not so receive them. Thus they are accursed by the Council of Trent,† that say, "We are formally justified by the righteousness of Christ," (the only formal cause of our justification being the justice of God; as it is there declared, cap. 8.) or that "we are justified by the alone imputation of Christ's righteousness;" or that shall say, "justifying faith is nothing else than a trust or confidence in the divine mercy, forgiving sins for Christ's sake," &c. In which, and the like, unless the Church of England will curse those whom she doth bless, and cast out of her communion such as

* Apology for the Protestants, done out of French into English, 1681, part. 4. cap. 3. p. 135, 150.

† Sess. 6. Can. 10, 11, 12, &c. [Labbe, Conc. vol. 14. p. 765. Lut. Par. 1672.]

she receives into it, she can no more be reconciled to the Church of Rome, than in those other points that for the matter of them are held and declared by herself to be false and erroneous.

4. There are Articles which the two Churches do in whole, or in part, so differ in, that the doctrine of the Church of England cannot be the doctrine of the Church of Rome; nor the doctrine of the Church of Rome be the doctrine of the Church of England. Such are most, if not all, of these following articles; *viz.* Art. 6. of the Sufficiency of the holy Scriptures for Salvation: Art. 9. of Original Sin: Art. 11. of the Justification of Man: Art. 13. of Works before Justification: Art. 14. of Works of Supererogation: Art. 15. of Christ alone without Sin: Art. 19. of the Church: Art. 20. of the Authority of the Church: Art. 21. of the Authority of General Councils: Art. 22. of Purgatory: Art. 24. of speaking in the Congregation in such a tongue as the people understandeth: Art. 25. of the Sacraments: Art. 28. of the Lord's Supper: Art. 29. of the wicked which eat not the body of Christ: Art. 30. of both kinds: Art. 31. of the Oblation of Christ upon the Cross: Art. 32. of the Marriage of Priests: Art. 34. of the Tradition of the Church: Art. 35. of the Homilies: Art. 36. of the Consecration of Bishops and Ministers: Art. 37. of the civil Magistrates. These, besides several others which our Articles do not expressly mention (but are commonly the received principles of our Church), are the irreconcilable points; and which all the wit and charity in the world, can no more thoroughly reconcile, than light and darkness.

How far this is true, and demonstrated to be so in the following sheets, I shall leave to the consideration of every intelligent reader. In which I have proceeded with care and impartiality from point to point: laying down first the doctrine of each Church from unquestionable authorities, for my own justification; and then for the ease of the reader, I have summed it up, and set each in opposition to each other. From all which I doubt not, but whatever friendship may be maintained betwixt the members of both Churches, as we are fellow-subjects, yet it will be evident, that there is no possibility of agreement between them in matters of religion, of making one Church of what are so manifestly two.

It is upon the last sort I am now to proceed; and the first of which, in order, is the sixth Article of the Church of England.

THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND
AND ROME.*The sixth Article of the Church of England.—Of the
Sufficiency of the holy Scripture for Salvation.*

“Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation: so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an Article of the Faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation. In the name of the holy Scripture, we do understand those Canonical Books of the Old and New Testament, of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church. The names and number of the Canonical Books, Genesis, &c. And the other books (as Jerome saith) the Church doth read for example of life and instruction of manners; but yet doth not apply them to establish any doctrine. Such are these following, the third book of Esdras, the fourth book of Esdras, the book of Tobias, the book of Judith, the rest of Esther. [And the fourteen books commonly called Apocrypha.] All the books of the New Testament, as they are commonly received, we do receive, and account them canonical.”*

*The twentieth Article of the Church of England.—Of the
Authority of the Church.*

“Although the Church be a witness, and a keeper of holy writ; yet as it ought not to decree any thing against the same, so besides the same ought it not to enforce any thing to be believed for necessity of salvation.”†

*Homily the first, or an Exhortation to the reading and
knowledge of holy Scripture.*

“There is in the Scripture, whatsoever is meet for all ages and sorts of men. These books ought therefore to be much in our hands, in our eyes, in our ears, in our mouths, but most of all in our hearts.”

Homily second, or an Exhortation, &c.

“Surely none be enemies to the reading of God’s word, but such as either be so ignorant, that they know not how wholesome a thing it is; or else be so sick, that they hate the most comfortable medicine should heal them; or so ungodly, that they would wish the people still to continue in blindness and ignorance of God.”

* Art. 6.

† Art. 20.

The Church of Rome.—The Council of Trent.

"The holy and general Synod of Trent considering, that all saving truth and instruction of manners, is contained in books written and traditions not written (which received from Christ himself, by the Apostles, or from the Apostles, the Holy Spirit dictating, delivering as it were from hand to hand, have come even to us), following the examples of the orthodox Fathers, doth receive and regard with the like affection of piety and reverence, all the books of the Old and New Testament, as also those unwritten traditions pertaining to faith and manners, dictated by Christ, as it were by word of mouth, or by the Holy Ghost, and preserved by a continual succession in the Catholic Church, and hath thought fit to add the Index of the Sacred Books to this decree, lest it should be doubted which they are, that are received by the sacred Synod. They are these following, the five books of Moses, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, four books of Kings, two of Chronicles, one of Esdras (called Nehemias), Tobias, Judith, Hesther, Job, the Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticles, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Isaias, Jeremias, with Baruch, Ezekiel, Daniel, the twelve lesser Prophets, the two books of Maccabees. The New Testament, *viz.* the four Evangelists, &c. And if any one shall not receive those whole books with all their parts, for sacred and canonical, according as they are wont to be read in the catholic Church, and are contained in the ancient vulgar Latin edition; or shall knowingly and wittingly condemn the foresaid traditions, let him be accursed."*

So that the Church of Rome hath added to the canon of Scripture, truly and properly so called, six whole books, *viz.* Tobit, Ecclesiasticus, Wisdom, Judith, the first and second of the Maccabees, together with certain other pieces of Baruch, Esther, and Daniel.

"Mystical benedictions, lights, incensings, garments, and many other such like things, are of apostolical discipline and tradition. The ceremonies used in baptism were, without controversy, instituted by the Apostles: such as, salt, spittle, exorcisms, wax-candles, catechism."†—Par. 2. cap. 2. § 59, 60, 65, &c.

(See below, Articles 19th and 34th of the Church of England.)

"Futhermore, for the restraining all wanton wits, the Synod doth decree, that no one (depending on his own wisdom, in

* Sess. 4. decret. de Canon. Script. [Labbe, ut supra, p. 746.]

† Council Trent, Sess. 22. cap. 5. [Ibid. p. 854.]

matters of faith and manners belonging to the edification of Christian doctrine, wresting the Scriptures in his own sense) dare to interpret the holy Scripture contrary to the sense which holy mother Church hath held, and doth hold (to whom it belongs to judge of the sense and interpretation of the holy Scriptures), or against the unanimous consent of the Fathers, although such interpretations should never be published.”*

The Index of prohibited Books, with the rules made by the Fathers of the Tridentine Synod, approved by the authority of Pius IV. An. 1564.

“Seeing it is manifest by experience, if the holy Bible be permitted to be read every where without difference in the vulgar tongue, that more prejudice than benefit doth redound from thence through the rashness of men, let it therefore be at the pleasure of the bishop or inquisitor, that, with the advice of the parish priest or confessor, they may grant the reading of the Bible, translated by Catholic authors, to such as they shall understand will, by such reading, receive no prejudice, but an increase of faith and piety; which license let them have in writing. But whosoever shall, without such license, presume to read or have such Bibles, he may not have the absolution of his sins before he has returned them to the ordinary.”†

The same Index being enlarged by Sextus V., and reviewed and published by order of Clement VIII. anno 1595, there is added the following observation about the foresaid rule:—

“It is to be considered, about the above-written fourth rule of Pope Pius IV., that there is no new power given by this impression and edition to the bishops or inquisitors, or superiors of regulars, of granting a license to buy, read, or keep the Bible published in the vulgar tongue; seeing the power of granting such licenses of reading or keeping vulgar Bibles, or any parts of them, hath been taken away by the command and use of the holy Roman Church, and the holy Inquisition; as also all summaries and compendiums of the said Bibles, and books of holy Scripture, written in any vulgar tongue; which truly is inviolably to be observed.”

So that the power of granting such licenses, and the liberty of reading the Scripture in the vulgar tongue,‡ is wholly taken away; and accordingly we are told it is so ordered by the General Inquisition of Spain.

* Sess. 4. Decretum de Edit. et usu Sac. Libr. [Ibid. p. 746.]

† Regula 4. [Ibid. p. 953.]

‡ Azorius Instit. Mor. l. 8. cap. 26. ss. Quæritur; et ss. Quæres.

From all which we may observe:—

The Opposition.

The Church of England.

1. Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation.

2. Whatsoever is not read in Scripture, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man to be believed as an article of faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation.

3. In the name of the holy Scripture, is understood those canonical books of the Old and New Testament of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church; and the other (the Apocrypha) the Church doth not apply to establish any doctrine.

4. The Scriptures were intended for, and are to be read by all.

5. The Scriptures are useful for all.

6. The Church is a witness and keeper of holy writ.

The Church of Rome.

1. All saving truth is in books written, and traditions unwritten.

2. The Church doth receive and regard unwritten traditions with the like piety and reverence as the books of the Old and New Testament; and if any one shall knowingly condemn those traditions, he is accursed.

3. The books of Scripture are, the five books of Moses, &c., Tobias, Judith, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Baruch, the two books of Maccabees, &c.; and if any one shall not receive these whole books, with all their parts, for canonical, he is accursed.

4. The Scriptures ought not to be read by the vulgar.

5. If the Bible is permitted to be read by all, more prejudice than benefit doth arise from it.

6. It belongs to the mother Church of Rome to judge of the sense and interpretation of Scripture.

The seventh Article of the Church of England.—Of the Old Testament.

“The Old Testament is not contrary to the New; for, both in the Old and New Testament, everlasting life is offered to mankind by Christ, who is the only Mediator between God and man, being both God and man.”*

* Art. 7.

The Council of Trent.

"The saints reigning with Christ do offer prayers to God for men, and it is good and profitable to invoke them."*

"The most holy mother of God, by her intercession, doth reconcile God to sinners: she is the mother of mercy, and advocatress of the faithful."†

The Opposition.

The Church of England.

The Church of Rome.

Christ is the only Mediator
between God and man.

The Virgin Mary and saints
are mediators in heaven.

See more, Article 22.

*The ninth Article of the Church of England.—Of original,
or birth Sin.*

"Original sin standeth not in the following of Adam, (as the Pelagians vainly do talk,) but it is the fault and corruption of the nature of every man, that naturally is engendered, of the offspring of Adam," &c.‡

The Church of Rome.—The Council of Basil.

"We do define and declare, &c. the doctrine that declares the glorious Virgin Mary to have been always free from original and actual sin, holy and immaculate, is to be approved, retained, and embraced by all Catholics as pious and consonant to ecclesiastical worship, the Catholic faith, right reason, and holy Scripture; and that, for the future, it shall be lawful for none to preach or teach the contrary."§

The Council of Trent.

"This holy Synod doth declare, that it is not its intention to comprehend, in this decree concerning original sin, the blessed and immaculate Virgin Mary, the mother of God, but that the constitutions of Pope Sixtus IV. of happy memory, are to be observed under the penalties therein contained, which it doth enforce."|| Of the sense of these two Councils in this matter, see Joh. Baptistæ de Lezana Apol. pro immacul. Concept. cap. 13.

* Sess. 25. de Invoat. [Labbe, ut supra, p. 895.]

† Catech. Trid. par. 4. cap. 5. ss. 8. [p. 405. Lips. 1847.]

‡ Art. 9.

§ Sess. 36. Anno 1439. [Labbe, Concil. vol. 17. p. 394. Venet. 1731.]

|| Sess. 5. [p. 23. Paris. 1832.]

*The Opposition.**The Church of England.*

Original sin is the fault and corruption of the nature of every person naturally engendered of the offspring of Adam.

So that none is excepted but our blessed Saviour.

The Church of Rome.

The Virgin Mary was free from original sin.

The eleventh Article of the Church of England.—Of the Justification of Man.

“We are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, by faith, and not for our own work and deservings. Wherefore, that we are justified by faith only, is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort, as is more largely expressed in the homily of justification.”*

The first part of the Homily of Salvation.

“Because all men be sinners, and therefore can no man, by his own acts, words, and deeds (seem they never so good), be justified and made righteous before God; but every man is constrained to seek for another righteousness or justification, to be received at God’s own hands, that is to say, the forgiveness of his sins: and this justification or righteousness [the forgiveness of our sins], which we so receive of God’s mercy, and Christ’s merits embraced by faith, is taken, accepted, and allowed of God, for our perfect and full justification.

“Faith doth not shut out repentance, hope, love, dread and the fear of God, to be joined with faith in every man that is justified, but it shutteth them out from the office of justifying,” (that is, meritoriously, as the homily shews.)

The third part of the Homily of Salvation.

“The meaning of this proposition or saying, ‘we be justified by faith in Christ only,’ according to the meaning of the old ancient authors, is this, we put our faith in Christ, that we be justified by him only, that we be justified by God’s free mercy, and the merits of our Saviour Christ only, and by no virtue or good works of our own.”

* Art. 11.

The Church of Rome.—The Council of Trent.

“Justification is not only the remission of sins, but the sanctification and renovation of the inward man, from whence a man of unjust is made just.* If any one shall say, that men are justified, either by the only imputation of Christ’s righteousness, or by the alone remission of our sins, excluding the grace and love which is spread in their hearts by the Holy Ghost, and doth inhere in them; or that the grace by which we are justified, is only the favour of God; let him be accursed.”†

“It is called our righteousness, because we are justified by it inhering in us.”‡

“If any one shall say, that the wicked is justified by faith alone, so that he understands nothing else to be required, which may co-operate to obtain the grace of justification, and that it is not at all necessary that he be prepared and disposed by the motion of his own will; let him be accursed.”§

*The Opposition.**The Church of England.*

1. Placeth the nature of justification in the forgiveness of sins.

2. Saith, We are accounted righteous only for the merit of Christ.

The Church of Rome.

1. Saith, justification is not only the forgiveness of sin, but also that it is the sanctification of our natures (confounding justification with sanctification), and that whoever holds the contrary, is accursed.

2. Saith, We are justified by a righteousness inhering in us.

The twelfth Article of the Church of England.—Of Good Works.

“Albeit that good works which are the fruits of faith, and follow after justification, cannot put away our sins, and endure the severity of God’s judgment, yet are they pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ, and do spring out necessarily of a true and lively faith; insomuch that by them a lively faith may be as evidently known, as a tree discerned by the fruit.”||

* Sess. 6. cap. 7. [Labbe, Concil. vol. 14. p. 759. Lut. Par. 1672.]

† Can. 11. [Ibid. p. 765.]

§ Can. 9. [Ibid. p. 765.]

‡ Cap. 16. [Ibid. p. 763.]

|| Art. 12.

Homily of Good Works. And first of Fasting.

"To have any affiance, or to put any confidence in our works, as by merit and deserving of them to purchase to ourselves and others remission of sin, and so consequently everlasting life, is mere blasphemy of God's mercy, and great derogation to the blood-shedding of our Saviour Jesus Christ."

Sermon of Salvation, part 3.

"Our own imperfection is so great, through the corruption of original sin, that all is imperfect that is within us. Faith, charity, hope, dread, thoughts, words and works; and therefore not apt to merit or deserve any part of our justification for us."

The Church of Rome.—The Council of Trent.

"Justified persons are esteemed to have truly deserved eternal life."*

"If any one shall say, the good works of the justified are so the gifts of God, that they are not also the good merits of the person justified; or that by the good works which are done by him, through the grace of God and merit of Christ, he doth not truly merit an increase of grace, eternal life, and the obtaining of eternal life (if he shall depart in grace) and also an increase of glory; let him be accursed."†

The Rhemists' Annotations.

"This place convinceth for the Catholics, that all good works done by God's grace after the first justification, be truly and properly meritorious, and fully worthy of everlasting life; and that thereupon heaven is the due and just stipend, crown or recompense, which God by his justice oweth to the persons so working by his grace; for he rendereth or repayeth heaven as a just judge, and not only as a merciful giver; and the crown which he payeth, is not only of mercy, or favour, or grace; but also of justice."‡

*The Opposition.**The Church of England.*

1. The best works are imperfect, and cannot endure the severity of God's judgment.

2. To put any confidence in our works, and to think they merit everlasting life, is blasphemy.

The Church of Rome.

1. The good works of the justified, do truly merit eternal life.

2. Whosoever saith they do not properly merit, is accursed.

* Sess. 6. cap. 16. [Ibid. p. 763.]

† Can. 32. [Ibid. p. 768.]

‡ Annot. in 2 Tim. iv. 8. 1 Cor. iii. 8. and Hebr. vi. 10.

The thirteenth Article of the Church of England.—Of Works before Justification.

“Works done before the grace of Christ, and the inspiration of his Spirit, are not pleasant to God, forasmuch as they spring not of faith in Jesu Christ, neither do they make men to see the grace, or (as school-authors say) deserve grace of congruity.* Yea rather, for that they are not done as God hath willed, and commanded them to be done; we doubt not but they have the nature of sin.”†

The Church of Rome.

It was a common opinion in the Church of Rome, that works done before the grace of Christ, do make men meet to deserve grace of congruity, or that man by the power of nature can dispose himself for justification. Of this opinion were Scotus, Durandus, Biel, Cajetan, &c.

Council of Trent.

“If any one shall say, that all works before justification, for whatever reason they are done, are truly sins, or deserve the hatred of God; let him be accursed.”‡

*The Opposition.**The Church of England.*

1. Works done before justification, do not deserve grace of congruity.

2. Works done before justification, have the nature of sin.

The Church of Rome.

1. Works done before justification, do merit it of congruity.

2. Whoever shall say, works done before justification are truly sins, is accursed.

The fourteenth Article of the Church of England.—Of Works of Supererogation.

“Voluntary works besides over and above God’s commandments, which they call works of supererogation, cannot be taught without arrogancy and impiety. For by them men do declare that they do not only render unto God, as much as they are bound to do, but that they do more for his sake, than of bounden duty is required: whereas Christ saith plainly, when ye have done all things that are commanded to you, say, we are unprofitable servants.”§

* Art. 13.

† See Bishop Usher’s Answer to a Challenge, Chap. 11.

‡ Sess. 6. cap. 7. [Can. 7. Ibid. p. 765.]

§ Art. 14.

Second Part of the Sermon of good Works.

“Which sects and religions in the Church of Rome, had so many hypocritical and feigned works, in their state of religion (as they arrogantly named it), that their lamps (as they said) run always over, able to satisfy, not only for their own sins, but also for all their benefactors, brothers and sisters of religion, as most ungodlily and trustily they had persuaded the multitude of ignorant people; keeping in divers places, as it were marts or markets of merit, being full of their holy relics, images, shrines, and works of overflowing abundance, ready to be sold.”

The Church of Rome.—The Catechism.

“In this the goodness and clemency of God is to be praised, who hath granted to our weakness, that one may satisfy for another, &c. And such as are endued with divine grace, can pay in the name of another, what is due to God.”*

Rhemists' Annotations.

“The works which we do more than precept, be called works of supererogation; and whereby (that is from what was above said) it is also evident against the Protestants that there be such works.”†

“This place proveth plainly, that the fastings and satisfactory deeds of one man, be available to others. Yea, and that holy saints or other virtuous persons, may in measure and proportion of other men's necessities and deservings allot unto them, as well the supererogation of their spiritual works, as those that abound in worldly goods may give alms of their superfluities to them which are in necessity.”‡

“We infer most assuredly, that the satisfactory and penal works of holy saints suffered in this life, be communicable and applicable to the use of other faithful men, and to be dispensed according to every man's necessity and deserving, by them whom Christ hath constituted over his family, and hath made the dispensers of his treasures.§

*The Opposition.**The Church of England.*

1. That men may do more for God's sake, than of bounden duty is required, cannot be taught without arrogancy and impiety.

The Church of Rome.

1. That men may do works of supererogation, and more than is commanded.

* Pars 2, de Sacram. Poenit. ss. 77. [Sect. 109. p. 290. Mechlin. 1831.]

† Luke xi. ver. 35.

‡ 2 Cor. viii. 14.

§ Annot. on 2 Cor. ii. 10.

2. That any may be able not only to satisfy for their own sins, but also for the sins of others, is a most ungodly doctrine.

2. That what they do more than is commanded, may be allotted to others, and which such may have the benefit of.

The fifteenth Article of the Church of England.—Of Christ alone without sin.

“Christ in the truth of our nature was made like unto us in all things, sin only except, from which he was clearly void, both in his flesh and in his spirit, &c. But all we the rest (although baptized, and born again in Christ) yet offend in many things; and if we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us.”*

The Church of Rome.—The Council of Trent.

“If any one shall say,† that any one can avoid all sins, such also as are venial, in the whole course of his life, except by special privilege from God, as the Church doth hold concerning the blessed Virgin; let him be accursed.”

The Rhemists.

“Our Lady had so much grace given her; that she never sinned, not so much as venially in all her life.”‡

The Opposition.

The Church of England.

Christ alone is without sin, but all the rest of mankind offend in many things, none being excepted.

The Church of Rome.

The Virgin Mary is excepted, having never sinned so much as venially.

The nineteenth Article of the Church of England.—Of the Church.

“The visible Church of Christ, is a congregation of faithful men, in which the pure Word of God is preached, and the sacraments be duly ministered according to Christ’s ordinance, in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same. §

“As the Church of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch, have erred; so also the Church of Rome hath erred, not only in their living, and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of faith.”

* Art. 15.

† Sess. 6. can. 23. [Ibid. p. 766.]

‡ Annot. on Mar. iii. 34.

§ Art. 19.

§ 1. *Of the Church.*

The visible Church is where the Word of God is preached, and the sacraments be duly ministered, in all things of necessity requisite.

The Church of Rome.—The fifth General Council of Lateran.

“The sacred Doctors have affirmed, that the unity of the Church doth consist in two things. 1. In the conjunction of the members of the Church one with another.* 2. In their order to one head, the Vicar of Christ, according to the saying of the Apostle, Not holding the head.”

The Catechism of the Council of Trent.—Of the Notes of the true Church.

“The first note is, that it be one.† And it is called one, as there is one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism. There is one Governor, the invisible Christ; the visible, who (being the lawful successor of Peter, prince of the Apostles) doth possess the Roman chair.”

The Opposition.

The Church of England.

The Church of Rome.

The notes of a true Church, are the pure word preached, and the due ministration of the sacraments.

The necessary note of the true Church is the being united to the Bishop of Rome.

§ 2. *Of the Fallibility of the Church of Rome.*

“The Church of Rome hath erred, as well as other Churches, in living, ceremonies, and faith.”‡

The Church of Rome hath erred in Ceremonies.—The Common-Prayer Book. §

“Of such ceremonies as be used in the Church, and have had their beginning by the institution of man, some are put away, because the great excess and multitude of them hath so increased in these latter days, that the burthen of them was intolerable. This our excessive multitude of ceremonies was so great, and many of them so dark, that they did more confound, than declare and set forth Christ’s benefits unto us.

* Orat. Archiep. Spalat. [Labbe, Concil. Ibid. p. 53, 54.]

† Par. 1. de 9. Art. Symb. ss. 11. [Sect. 14, 15. ut supra, p. 90.]

‡ N. 1. ‡ Rubric, of Ceremonies, why some be abolished, &c.

Furthermore, the most weighty cause of the abolishment of some ceremonies was, that they were so far abused, partly by the superstitious blindness of the rude and unlearned, and partly by the unsatiable avarice," &c.

The second part of the Homily of place and time of Prayer.

"They have profaned and defiled their churches with heathenish and Jewish abuses, with images and idols, with numbers of altars, too too superstitiously and intolerably abused, with gross abusing and filthy corrupting of the Lord's holy supper, the blessed sacrament of his body and blood, with an infinite number of toys and trifles, of their own devices, to make a goodly outward show, and to deface the plain, simple, and sincere religion of Christ."

The Church of Rome.—The Council of Trent.

"The Church has appointed ceremonies, as mystical benedictions, lights, incensings, garments, and such like, that the majesty of so great a sacrifice might be recommended, and the minds of the faithful be excited, &c.*

"If any one shall say, that the ceremonies, garments, and external signs, which the Catholic Church doth use in the celebration of mass, are rather incitements of impiety, than helps to piety; let him be accursed.†

"If any one shall say, they are injurious to the Holy Spirit, that give some virtue to the holy chrism of confirmation; let him be accursed."‡

The Catechism.

"The sacrifice of the mass hath many, and those very remarkable and solemn rites; none of which is to be esteemed needless and vain."§

The Opposition.

The Church of England.

1. The ceremonies in the Church of Rome, were for their multitude, an intolerable burden.

2. They do more confound,

The Church of Rome.

1. The ceremonies used are many, but solemn, and for the majesty of worship.

2. They do recommend the

* Sess. 22. c. 5. [ut supra, p. 854.]

† Ibid. Can. 7. [p. 855.]

‡ Sess. 7. Can. 2. [Ibid. p. 779.]

§ Par. 2. cap. 4. de Euchar. ss. 81. [Sect. 89. ut supra, p. 244.]

than set forth Christ's benefits, and do deface the plain and sincere religion of Christ.

3. They are toys and trifles.

4. They do profane and defile the churches where they are used.

worship, and excite the minds of the faithful.

3. None of them are needless and vain; but have a virtue in them.

4. Whosoever shall say, that they are incitements of impiety, is accursed.

See Articles 6th and 34th.

The Church of Rome hath erred in matters of faith.—The second part of the Homily concerning the Holy Ghost.*

"If ye will compare the notes of a true Church, with the Church of Rome, as it is presently, and hath been for the space of nine hundred years and odd: you shall well perceive the state thereof to be so far wide from the nature of the true Church, that nothing can be more; where is then the Holy Ghost, which they do so stoutly claim to themselves? Where is now the Spirit of truth, that will not suffer them in any wise to err, &c. It is but a vain brag and nothing else."

The Church of Rome.—The Council of Trent.

"The holy Synod delivering that sound and sincere doctrine, which the Catholic Church being taught by Jesus Christ himself, and the Apostles, and by the Holy Spirit suggesting all truth from day to day to her, hath retained, and will preserve to the end of the world; doth straightly charge all the faithful of Christ, that they dare not after this, believe or teach otherwise, concerning the holy eucharist, than is explained and defined in this decree."†

The Catechism.

"The Church cannot err in delivering the discipline of faith and manners."‡

The Rhemists' Annotations.

"By this promise we are assured, that no heresies, or other wicked attempts, can prevail against the Church builded upon Peter, which the Fathers call Peter's See, and the Roman Church."§

* N. 2.

† Sess. 13. init. [Ibid. p. 804.]

‡ Par. 1. de 9. Artic. Symb. ss. 18. [sect. 19. ut supra, p. 94.]

§ On Matth. xvi. 18.

*The Opposition.**The Church of England.*

1. The Church of Rome hath erred in matters of faith.
2. The pretence of the Church of Rome to infallibility, is nothing but a vain brag.

The Church of Rome.

1. The Church of Rome cannot err in matters of faith.
2. The Church of Rome is guided by the Holy Spirit from day to day, and cannot err.

*The twentieth Article of the Church of England.—Of the Authority of the Church.**

“It is not lawful for the Church to ordain any thing that is contrary to God’s Word written, &c., wherefore although the Church be a witness and keeper of holy writ, yet as it ought not to decree any thing against the same; so besides the same ought it not to enforce any thing to be believed for necessity of salvation.”

The Church of Rome.—The Council of Constance.

“Although Christ hath instituted, and did administer the sacrament of the eucharist in bread and wine, yet this notwithstanding, the authority of the sacred canons, and the approved custom of the Church, is to be preserved, that it be not received after supper, &c. And likewise, that although the sacrament was received in both kinds, in the Primitive Church, yet the custom is reasonably introduced, that the laics receive in one kind, &c. And we do command that no Presbyter do communicate the people in both.”

The Council of Trent.

“This holy Synod being taught by the Holy Spirit, doth declare and teach, that laymen are obliged by no divine precept to receive in both kinds, and that communion in one is sufficient for salvation.†

“Furthermore she declares, that this power hath always been in the Church, that in dispensing the sacraments (the substance of them being preserved) she might appoint and change those things which she doth judge more expedient for the profit of the receivers, and the reverence of the sacrament, &c. Wherefore holy mother Church, acknowledging [avowing] this her authority, &c. for weighty and just causes doth decree, that the eucharist be communicated in one kind.”§

* Art. 20.

† Sess. 13. [Ibid. vol. 12. p. 100.]

‡ Sess. 21. cap. 1. [Ibid. vol. 14. p. 846.]

§ Ibid. cap. 2.

1. *General Council of Lateran.*

"We do altogether forbid presbyters, deacons and monks, to contract matrimony; and we do determine, that marriages so contracted be disjoined."*

The Creed of Pius IV.

In which it is declared, that the Church of Rome is the mother and mistress of all other Churches. That the Pope is successor to St. Peter, and vicar of Christ. That in the mass is a real transubstantiation of the elements into the body and blood of Christ, &c. And that all things professed in that creed, are the Catholic faith, out of which no man can be saved.

*The Opposition.**The Church of England.*

1. Saith that it is not lawful for the Church to ordain any thing contrary to God's written word.

2. The Church ought not to enforce any thing besides the written word to be believed for necessity of salvation.

The Church of Rome.

1. The Church of Rome hath ordained things contrary to God's written word; as, in requiring the sacrament to be administered in one kind; in forbidding and disannulling the marriage of priests.

2. The Church of Rome doth require things, at least, besides the word, to be believed as necessary to salvation: as that the Pope is vicar of Christ, and St. Peter's successor; that there are properly and truly seven sacraments instituted by Christ, &c.

The twenty-first Article of the Church of England.—Of the Authority of General Councils.

"General Councils may not be gathered together without the commandment and will of princes. And when they be gathered together (forasmuch as they be an assembly of men, whereof all be not governed with the Spirit and Word of God) they may err, and sometimes have erred in things pertaining unto God. Wherefore things ordained by them, as necessary to salvation, have neither strength nor authority, unless it may be declared that they be taken out of holy Scripture."†

* Cap. 21. [can. 21.] [Ibid. vol. 10. p. 899.]
VOL. XIII.

†Art. 21.

The Church of Rome.—Council of Trent.

"It belongs to the Popes to call and direct General Councils.*

"The holy, universal and general Synod of Trent, lawfully gathered together in the Holy Ghost—taught by the Holy Spirit, which is a Spirit of wisdom and understanding, &c. doth declare and teach."

The Rhemists' Annotations.

"To teach all truth, and preserve in truth, and from error, the Holy Ghost is promised and performed only to the Church, and the chief governor and General Councils thereof.†

"The holy Councils lawfully kept, &c. have ever the assistance of God's Spirit, and therefore cannot err in their sentences and determinations concerning the same, because the Holy Ghost cannot err, from whom (as you see here) jointly with the Council, the resolution proceedeth."‡

*The Opposition.**The Church of England.*

1. General Councils may not be gathered without the command and will of princes.

2. General Councils have erred, and may err.

The Church of Rome.

1. It belongs to the Pope to call General Councils.

2. General Councils called by the Pope cannot err.

The twenty-second Article of the Church of England.—Of Purgatory.

"The Romish doctrine concerning purgatory, pardons, worshipping and adoration, as well of images as of relics, and also invocation of saints, is a fond thing, vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the word of God."§

Sect. I. Purgatory.

The Romish doctrine concerning purgatory, is a fond thing, vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, &c.

Third part of the Homily concerning Prayer.

"If we will cleave only unto the word of God, then we must needs grant, that we have no commandment to pray for them

* Sess. 11. Bulla resum. & Decretum de Resum. Conc. Sess. 21. init. & cap. 1. [Ibid. vol. 14. p. 793, 799, &c.]

† Rhem. Annot. Joh. xvi. 13.

‡ On Acts xvi. 28.

§ Art. 22.

that are departed out of this world. For the Scripture doth acknowledge but two places after this life. The one proper to the elect and blessed of God, the other to the reprobate.

"There is no place for repentance, nor yet for satisfaction,—As the Scripture teacheth us, let us think, that the soul of man, passing out of the body, goeth straightways to heaven, or else to hell, whereof the one needeth no prayer, the other is without redemption."

The Church of Rome.—The Council of Trent.

"Seeing it hath been lately taught in this universal Synod from Scripture, &c. that there is a purgatory, and that the souls there detained, are helped by the suffrages of the faithful, but most of all by the acceptable sacrifice of the altar; the holy Synod doth command the bishops, that they take diligent care, that the sound doctrine concerning purgatory, be believed, taught, &c.*

"If any one shall say, that the fault is so remitted to every penitent sinner, that there remains no guilt to be paid for in purgatory, before there be an entrance granted into the kingdom of heaven; let him be accursed.†

"If any one shall say, that the sacrifice of the mass ought not to be offered for the dead, &c. let him be accursed."‡

The Opposition.

The Church of England.

1. The Romish doctrine concerning purgatory, is a fond thing, vainly invented.

2. It is grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather is repugnant to it.

The Church of Rome.

1. The doctrine of purgatory is necessary to be believed, and whosoever doth not believe it, is accursed.

2. It is taught from Scripture.

Sect. II. Pardons.

The Romish doctrine concerning pardons is a fond thing, vainly invented, &c.

The Church of Rome.—Rhemists' Annotations.

"To restore offenders to the Church's sacraments and communion of the faithful, to pardon also, either all, or part of the penance enjoined, or what debts soever man oweth to God, or

* Sess 25. Decret. de Purgat. [Ibid. p. 894.]

† Sess. 6. Can. 30. [Ibid. p. 767.]

‡ Sess. 22. Can. 3. [Ibid p. 855.]

the Church, for the satisfaction of his sins forgiven, is called indulgence."*

First General Council of Lateran.

"We do grant remission of their sins, to whosoever do go to Jerusalem, and shall efficaciously afford their help to oppose the infidels."†

Fourth General Council of Lateran.

"The Catholics, that having taken upon them the character of the cross, shall address themselves to the destruction of heretics, enjoy that indulgence, and are armed with the same privilege which is granted to those that go to the relief of the holy land."‡

The Council of Constance.

"The holy Synod doth grant to every one that goes in the appointed procession, an hundred days of indulgence, &c. And to those that once a day say devoutly a paternoster, and Ave-Maria, for the safety of the emperor, forty days of indulgence, in the accustomed form of the Church."§

The Council of Trent.

"Indulgences are the heavenly treasures of the Church. Seeing the power of indulgences hath been granted by Christ to the Church, this holy Synod doth teach, that the use of them is very wholesome to Christian people, and doth command that they be retained in the Church, and doth condemn them by an anathema that affirm them to be unprofitable, or deny that the Church hath a power to grant them."||

The Opposition.

The Church of England.

1. The Romish doctrine concerning indulgence is grounded upon no warrant of Scripture.

2. It is a fond thing, and vainly invented.

The Church of Rome.

1. The power of indulgences was granted by Christ.

2. They are wholesome to Christian people: and whosoever shall affirm them to be unprofitable, is accursed.

Sect. III. Of Images and Relics.

The Romish doctrine concerning the adoration, as well of images as of relics, is a fond thing, vainly invented, &c.

* On Matth. xvi. 19.

† Can 11. [Ibid. vol. 10. p. 897.]

‡ Can. 3. [Ibid. vol. 11. par. 1 p. 149.]

§ Sess. 16. [Sess. 17.] [Ibid. vol. 12. p. 161.]

|| Sess. 21. Cap. 9. Sess. 25. Decret. de Indulg. [Ibid. vol. 14. p. 852, 917.]

Second part of the Homily against Idolatry.

"Images and image-worship, were in the primitive Church (which was most pure and incorrupt) abhorred and detested, as abominable and contrary to all true religion."

Third part of the Homily against Images, &c.

"Let such as fall down before images of saints know and confess, that they exhibit that honour to dead stocks and stones, which the saints themselves, Peter, Paul, and Barnabas, would not be given to them when alive, &c.

"In this they pass the folly and wickedness of the Gentiles, that they honour and worship the relics and the bones of our saints, which prove that they be mortal men and dead, and therefore no gods to be worshipped, which the Gentiles would never confess of their gods for very shame; but the relics we must kiss and offer to, especially on Relics Sunday."

The Church of Rome.—The Council of Trent.

"The holy Synod doth command all bishops, and others, whose office it is to teach, that they instruct the faithful, according to the use of the Catholic and Apostolic Church, received from the first times of the Christian religion, concerning the honour of relics, and the lawful use of images.*

"The Synod doth decree, that the images of Christ, the virgin mother of God, and other saints, are to be had and retained, especially in churches, and that due honour and veneration be given them, &c., and when we kiss them, uncover the head, and fall down before them, we do adore Christ, and venerate the saints, whose similitude they bear.

"They are altogether to be condemned, and the Church doth condemn them, that they do deny the bodies of the saints and martyrs are to be venerated by the faithful, and that affirm that veneration and honour is not due to their relics, or that they are unprofitably honoured, &c.

"Whosoever shall teach or think any thing contrary to these decrees, let him be accursed."

*The Opposition.**The Church of England.*

1. Image-worship was abhorred in the primitive Church.

The Church of Rome.

1. Image worship was received from the first times of Christianity.

* Sess. 25. de Inocat. [Ibid. p. 895.]

2. The Romish doctrine of worshipping images and relics is a fond thing, &c.

3. It is grounded upon no Scripture, but is repugnant thereto.

2. The relics of the saints are to be venerated; and such as affirm they are not profitably honoured are to be condemned.

3. Whoever shall teach or think they are not to be venerated is accursed.

Sect. IV. Invocation of Saints.

Invocation of saints is a fond thing, vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, &c.

Second part of the Homily concerning Prayer.

"There are certain conditions most requisite to be found in every one, that must be called upon; which, if not found, our prayer doth avail us nothing. As, 1. That he to whom we pray, be able to help us. 2. That he will. 3. That he hear our prayer. 4. That he understand better than we ourselves what we lack. If these things be to be found in any other, saving only in God, then may we lawfully call upon some other besides God. But what man is so gross but that he well understandeth that those things are only proper to him which is omnipotent, and knoweth all things? that is to say, only to God alone; whereof it followeth, that we must call neither upon angel, nor yet upon saint, but only and solely upon God."

Third part of the Homily against Idolatry.

"If answer be made, that they make such saints but intercessors to God, &c., that is, after the Gentiles idolatrous usage, to make them of saints, gods, called *dii mediorumi*, &c."

The Church of Rome.—The Council of Trent.

"The holy Synod doth command bishops and others, that have the office of teaching, that they teach the faithful, that the saints reigning with Christ do offer prayers to God for men, and that it is good and profitable to invoke them; and for the obtaining of benefits to have recourse by Jesus Christ, our only Redeemer, to their prayers, aid, and help. But those that deny that they are to be invocated, or affirm that they do not pray for us, or the invocation of them, that they may pray for every one of us, is idolatry, and is contrary to the Word of God, and the honour of one Mediator Jesus Christ, do think wickedly.*

* Ibid.

“ If any one think or teach contrary to these doctrines let him be accursed.”

The Catechism of Trent.

“ We do fly to the most holy Mother of God, that by her intercession she may reconcile God to sinners. We ought to call upon her, the mother of mercy, and advocatress of faithful people, that she may pray for us sinners, &c., of which no one can, unless impiously and cursedly, doubt.”*

The Opposition.

The Church of England.

1. Invocation of saints is a fond thing.

2. It is repugnant to the Word of God.

3. To make them intercessors is idolatrous.

The Church of Rome.

1. Invocation of saints is good and profitable.

2. They who say it is contrary to the Word of God think wickedly.

3. Whosoever shall say it is idolatry, thinks wickedly, and is accursed.

*The twenty-third Article of the Church of England.—
Of Ministering in the Congregation.*

The Opposition.

The Church of England.

It is not lawful for any man to take upon himself the office, &c. of ministering the sacraments in the congregation, before he be lawfully called, and sent to execute the same. And those we ought to judge lawfully called and sent, which be chosen, and called to this work by men who have public authority, &c.†

The Church of Rome.

In necessity any of the people may baptize, whether men or women, of whatsoever sect, Jews, infidels, and heretics: if they intend thereby to do that which the Catholic Church intends to do. *Catechism of Trent*, par. 2. c. 11. sect. 24.

The twenty-fourth Article of the Church of England.—Of speaking in the Congregation in such a Tongue as the People understandeth.

The Opposition.

The Church of England.

It is a thing plainly repugnant to the Word of God, and the custom of the primitive

The Church of Rome.

It seemed not fit to the Fathers, that the mass be everywhere celebrated in the vulgar

* Par. 4. c. 5. ss. 8. [Sect. 6. p. 486. Mechl. 1831.]

† Art. 23.

Church, to have public prayer in the church, or to minister the sacraments in a tongue not understood of the people.*

See the Homily of Common Prayer and the Sacraments.

tongue. Wherefore the ancient rite is everywhere to be retained. Whosoever shall say that the mass ought to be celebrated only in the vulgar tongue, let him be accursed. *Council of Trent*, sess. 22. cap. 8, and Can. 9.

The twenty-fifth Article of the Church of England.—Of the Sacraments.

“There are two sacraments ordained of Christ our Lord in the Gospel, that is to say, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord.†

“Those five commonly called sacraments, that is to say, confirmation, penance, orders, matrimony, and extreme unction, are not to be counted for sacraments of the Gospel, being such as have grown, partly of the corrupt following of the Apostles, partly are states of life allowed in the Scriptures, but yet have not like nature of sacraments with baptism and the Lord’s supper, for that they have not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God. The sacraments were not ordained of Christ to be gazed upon, or to be carried about, but that we should duly use them. And in such only as worthily receive the same, they have a wholesome effect or operation, &c.‡

“There shall be no celebration of the Lord’s supper, except there be a convenient number to communicate with the priest, &c.”§

The Church of Rome.—The Council of Trent.

“If any one shall say that the sacraments of the new law, have not been all instituted by Christ, or that they are more or fewer than seven, *viz.* baptism, confirmation, the eucharist, penance, extreme unction, orders, and matrimony; or that any of these seven is not truly and properly a sacrament; let him be accursed.||

“If any one shall say that grace is not conferred (*ex opere operato*) by the work done in the sacraments of the new law; but that only faith in the divine promise is sufficient to obtain grace; let him be accursed.¶

“The Synod doth approve and commend those masses, in

* Art. 24.

† Art. 25.

‡ See the Homily of Common Prayer and the Sacraments.

§ Rubric after the Communion Service.

|| Sess. 7. Can. 1. [*Ibid.* p. 776.]

¶ Can. 8. [*Ibid.* p. 777.]

which the priest doth communicate alone; forasmuch as they ought to be esteemed truly common; partly, because the people do spiritually communicate; and partly they are celebrated for all the faithful, by a public minister of the Church.*

"If any one shall say, that the masses, in which the priest alone doth sacramentally communicate, are unlawful, and so to be abrogated, let him be accursed."†

The Opposition.

The Church of England.

1. There are but two sacraments ordained of Christ.

2. The other called sacraments, are either corruptions or states of life, but have not the nature of sacraments.

3. The sacraments in such only as worthily receive the same, have a wholesome effect and operation.

4. The sacraments were not ordained to be gazed upon, but to be used.

The Church of Rome.

1. There are seven sacraments truly and properly.

2 Whosoever shall say that any of the seven are not properly and truly sacraments, is accursed.

3. The sacraments do confer grace *ex opere operato*, and whosoever denies it is accursed.

4. Masses in which the priest alone sacramentally communicates, to be approved. And whosoever doth say, they are unlawful, is accursed.

The twenty-eighth Article of the Church of England.—Of the Lord's Supper.

"Transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of bread and wine) in the supper of the Lord cannot be proved by Holy Writ; but it is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions. The body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the supper only after an heavenly and spiritual manner: and the mean, whereby the body of Christ is received, and eaten in the supper, is faith."‡

"The sacrament of the Lord's supper, was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up and worshipped."

Rubric at the end of the Communion Service.

"No adoration ought to be done, either unto the sacramental bread and wine, there bodily received, or unto any corporal presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood. For the

* Sess. 22. cap. 6. [Ibid. p. 854.]

† Can. 8. [Ibid. p. 856]

‡ Art. 28.

sacramental bread and wine, remain still in their very natural substances, and therefore may not be adored (for that were idolatry to be abhorred of all faithful Christians). And the natural body and blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven, and not here; it being against the truth of Christ's natural body to be at one time in more places than one."

The Church of Rome.—The fourth General Council of Lateran.

"The body and blood of Christ are truly contained in the sacrament of the altar, under the species of bread and wine; the bread being transubstantiated into the body, and the wine into the blood, by the power of God;" &c.*

The Council of Trent.

"Whosoever shall deny that the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and so whole Christ, is contained in the sacrament of the eucharist, let him be accursed."†

"Whosoever shall deny that wonderful and singular conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood, the species only of bread and wine remaining: which conversion the Catholic Church most aptly calls transubstantiation; let him be accursed."‡

"If any one shall say, that the body and blood of Christ is only in use, not before and after; and that the true body of Christ doth not remain in the particles of it, reserved after the communion, let him be accursed."§

"If any one shall say, that Christ is not to be worshipped in the eucharist with divine worship, &c., or that he is not solemnly to be carried about, and shewed to the people that he may be worshipped, and that the worshippers are idolaters, let him be accursed."||

"If any one shall say, that Christ is only eaten spiritually, let him be accursed."¶

The Opposition.

The Church of England.

The Church of Rome.

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. The sacramental bread and wine after consecration, | 1. There are after consecration, only the species of the |
|---|--|

* Can. 1 Ibid. vol. 11. par. 1. p. 143.]

† Sess. 13. cap. 1. and can. 1. [Ibid. vol. 14. p. 805, 808.]

‡ Cap. 4. and can. 2. [Ibid. p. 806, 808.]

§ Can. 4. [Ibid. p. 808.]

|| Can. 6. [Ibid. p. 809.]

¶ Can. 8. [Ibid.]

remain in the very natural substances.

2. The natural body and blood of Christ are in heaven, and not here.

3. Transubstantiation is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, &c.

4. The body and blood of Christ is in the supper only eaten after an heavenly and spiritual manner.

5. The sacrament of the Lord's supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved.

6. The sacramental bread and wine may not be adored, for that is idolatry.

bread and wine in the eucharist; and the substance of bread and wine is converted into the body and blood of Christ.

2. The body and blood of Christ, together with his soul and divinity, is contained in the eucharist.

3. Whosoever shall deny transubstantiation, is accursed.

4. Whosoever shall say Christ is eaten only spiritually, is accursed.

5. Whosoever shall say, that the body and blood of Christ is only in use, and remains not in what is reserved, is accursed.

6. If any shall say, the host is not to be worshipped, or that to worship it is idolatry, he is accursed.

So that the Church of England is upon this Article under six anathemas, at least, of the Church of Rome, as appears.

The twenty-ninth Article of the Church of England.—Of the wicked, which eat not the body of Christ in the use of the Lord's Supper.

The Opposition.

The Church of England.

"The wicked, and such as be void of a lively faith, although they do carnally and visibly press with their teeth (as St. Augustine saith) the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ; yet in no wise are they partakers of Christ, &c."*

The Church of Rome.

"Ill men receive the body and blood of Christ, be they infidels, or ill livers." *Rhem. Annot. in 1 Cor. xi. 27.*

* Art. 29.

The thirtieth Article of the Church of England.—Of both Kinds.

"The cup of the Lord is not to be denied to the lay-people. For both the parts of the Lord's sacrament ought, by Christ's ordinance and commandment, to be ministered to all Christian men alike."*

The Church of Rome.—The Council of Trent.

"Although our Redeemer hath instituted the sacrament in his last supper, and hath delivered unto the Apostles in both kinds; yet it is to be confessed, that whole and entire Christ, and a true sacrament is taken under one kind only; and furthermore, that as to the benefit of it, they are defrauded of no grace necessary to salvation, who receive only in one kind.†

"The Synod hath decreed, that it should be received for a law, that the sacrament be administered in one kind.‡

"Whosoever shall say, That by the command of God, all the faithful ought to receive in both kinds, let him be accursed.§

"Whosoever shall say, that the holy Catholic Church hath not been induced for just causes and reasons, to order that lay-people, and priests not officiating, should communicate only under the species of bread; or that she hath erred therein, let him be accursed.||

"Whosoever shall deny whole and entire Christ, to be taken under one species, let him be accursed."¶

*The Opposition.**The Church of England.*

1. The cup is not to be denied to the lay-people.

2. The ministration in one kind is but part of a sacrament.

3. The sacrament ought to be administered in both kinds, according to Christ's commandment.

The Church of Rome.

1. The cup for just reasons is denied to the lay-people.

2. Whole Christ and a whole sacrament, is under one kind only.

3. Whosoever shall say, that the people ought to receive in both kinds by the command of God, is accursed.

The thirty-first Article of the Church of England.—Of the one Oblation of Christ, finished upon the Cross.

"The offering of Christ once made, is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world, both original and actual, and there is none other

* Art. 30.

† Cap. 2. [Ibid.]

‡ Can. 2. [Ibid.]

† Sess. 21. cap. 3. [Ibid. p. 847.]

§ Can. 1. [Ibid.]

¶ Can. 3. [Ibid.]

satisfaction for sin, but that alone. Wherefore the sacrifices of masses, in which it is commonly said, that the priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables, and dangerous deceits.”*

The Church of Rome.—The Council of Trent.

“Because in this divine sacrifice, which is performed in the mass, the self-same Christ is contained, and unbloodily offered, that offered himself once upon the altar of the cross; the holy Synod doth teach, that that sacrifice is truly propitiatory.†

“It is rightly offered, not only for the sins, punishments, and satisfactions, and other necessities of the faithful living, but also for the dead in Christ, not as yet fully purged, according to the tradition of the Apostles.

“If any one shall say, that there is not offered to God in the mass, a true and proper sacrifice, let him be accursed.‡

“If any one shall say, the sacrifice of the mass is not propitiatory; and that it profits him that takes it only; and that it ought not to be offered for the living and dead, for sins, punishments, satisfactions, and other necessities, let him be accursed.§

“If any one shall say, that by the sacrifice of the mass there is blasphemy offered to the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross; or that thereby any thing is derogated from him, let him be accursed.”||

The Opposition.

The Church of England.

1. The offering of Christ as a propitiation, was but once.

2. To say, that the priest offers for the living and the dead, in the mass, is blasphemous fables, and dangerous deceits.

The Church of Rome.

1. In the mass there is a propitiatory sacrifice offered daily.

2. Whoever denies that Christ is offered for the living and dead, or shall say that Christ and his sacrifice is thereby blasphemed, is accursed.

The thirty-second Article of the Church of England.—Of the Marriage of Priests.

“Bishops, priests and deacons, are not commanded by God’s law, either to vow the estate of single life, or to abstain

* Art. 31.

† Sess. 2. [Sess. 22.] cap. 2. [Ibid. p. 853.]

‡ Can. 1. [Ibid. p. 855.]

§ Can. 3. [Ibid.]

|| Can. 4. [Ibid.]

from marriage; therefore it is lawful also for them, as for all other Christian men, to marry at their own discretion, as they shall judge the same to serve better to godliness."*

Second part of the Homily of Good Works.

"This Pharisaical and papistical leaven, of man's feigned religion (in monastical vows) which although it were before God most abominable and contrary to God's commandments, and Christ's pure religion, yet it was praised to be a most godly life, and the highest state of perfection."

The Church of Rome.—First General Council of Lateran.

"We do altogether forbid presbyters, deacons and monks, to have concubines, or to contract matrimony; and according to the definitions of sacred canons, we do decree that marriages so contracted be separated, and that the persons ought to be brought to penance."†

The Second General Council of Lateran.

"We do decree, that they who being in the order of sub-deacon, and above, have married wives, and had concubines, shall not have an ecclesiastical benefice; for seeing they are the temple of God, &c. it is a shameful thing that they should serve beds and uncleannesses."‡

The Council of Trent.

"If any one shall say, that matrimony confirmed, not consummated, is not dissolved by the solemn profession of religion of either party, let him be accursed.§

"If any one shall say, that clerks in holy orders, or regulars, having solemnly professed chastity, may contract matrimony, and that so contracted it is valid, notwithstanding any ecclesiastical law, and vow, &c. And that all may contract matrimony, who perceive they have not the gift of chastity, though they have vowed it; let him be accursed."||

The Opposition.

The Church of England.

1. The marriage of priests is lawful.

The Church of Rome.

1. Priests ought not to marry; and if they marry, are to be separated.

* Art. 32.

† Cap. 21. [Can. 10.] [Ibid. vol. 10. p. 899.]

‡ Can. 6. [Ibid. p. 1003.]

§ Sess. 24. Can. 6. [Ibid. vol. 14. p. 875.]

|| Can. 9. [Ibid.]

2. The marriage of priests may serve to godliness.

2. the marriage of priests is a defiling the temple of God.

3. To vow against marriage, especially upon the account of perfection and purity, is a feigned religion, and contrary to God's commandment.

3. Vows against marriage do oblige, though the persons have not the gift of continency.

The thirty-fourth Article of the Church of England.—Of the Traditions of the Church.

"It is not necessary that traditions and ceremonies be in all places one or utterly like, for at all times they have been diverse, and may be changed according to the diversity of countries, times and men's manners, so that nothing be ordained against God's word.*

"Every particular or national Church hath authority to ordain, change, and abolish ceremonies, or rites of the Church, ordained only by man's authority, so that all things be done to edifying."

Second part of the Sermon of Good Works.

"Let us rehearse other kind of papistical superstitions and abuses, as of beads, lady-psalters, rosaries, purgatory, masses, stations, and jubilees, feigned relics, and hallowed beads, bread, water, candles," &c. See before, Article 6 and 9.

The Council of Trent.

"The holy Synod doth receive and regard with the like affection of piety and reverence, the Old and New Testament, and also those unwritten traditions dictated as it were by word of mouth by Christ, and preserved by continual succession in the Church.† The matter and form of extreme unction; mass for the dead; the pronouncing the mass sometimes with a loud, at other times with a low voice; mystical benedictions; lights; incensings; garments; and many other such like things, are from apostolical discipline and tradition.‡

"If any one shall say, that the rite of the Roman Church, of saying some part of the canon of the mass in a low voice, is to be condemned, let him be accursed."§

* Art. 34.

† Sess. 4. Decret. de Canon. Script. [Ibid. p. 746.]

‡ Sess. 14. cap. 1. [Ibid. p. 822.] Sess. 22. cap. 2. and 5. [Ibid. p. 853. 854.]

§ Can. 9. [Ibid. 856.]

The Catechism of Trent.

"The shaving of the head like a crown, is from apostolical tradition.*

"None of the rites in the mass are useless and vain."†

*The Opposition.**The Church of England.*

1. It is not necessary, that ceremonies ordained by man's authority, be in all places alike, and such may be changed.

2. Lights, and other ceremonies of the Romish church are superstitious, and abuses.

The Church of Rome.

1. Unwritten traditions are equally to be regarded as Scripture, such are lights, incensings, shaving the head, &c. and so to be every where and always retained.

2. None of the ceremonies used in the mass, as lights and incensings, are useless and vain.

The thirty-fifth Article of the Church of England.—Of Homilies.

"The homilies contain a godly and wholesome doctrine," &c.‡

The homilies charge the Church of Rome with error, superstition, idolatry and usurpation.

The thirty-sixth Article of the Church of England.—Of Consecration of Bishops and Ministers.

"The book of consecration of archbishops and bishops, and ordering of priests and deacons, lately set forth in the time of Edward VI. and confirmed at the same time by authority of Parliament, doth contain all things necessary to such consecration and ordering. And therefore, whosoever are consecrated or ordered, according to the rites of that book, or hereafter shall be consecrated or ordered according to the same rites: we decree all such to be rightly, orderly, and lawfully consecrated and ordered.§

The Church of Rome.—The Council of Trent.

"A sacrifice and priesthood, are so conjoined by the ordinance of God, that both have existed in every law.||

"From the very beginning of the Church, there were the

* Par. 2. cap. 7. ss. 14. [p. 265. Lips. 1847.]

† Cap. 4. ss. 81. [Ibid. p. 211.]

‡ Art. 35.

§ Art. 36.

|| Sess. 23. cap. 1. [Ibid. p. 862.]

names of the following orders; the lesser, *viz.* acolythi, exorcists, readers, and door-keepers. The greater and sacred, *viz.* the sub-deacon, deacon, and priest.”*

Rhemists' Annotations.

“Whosoever taketh upon him to preach without lawful sending to minister sacraments, and is not canonically ordered of a true catholic bishop to be a curate of souls, &c., he is a thief and a murderer. So came in all heretics, and all that succeed them in room and doctrine.”†

It is the common opinion of the members of the Romish Church of our nation, that our bishops, &c. are none.

“In the Church of England, there are no bishops, no pastors, and so theirs is no true church.”‡

“The ministers of the Church of England are no priests, because they want an essential part, which is to offer sacrifice, &c.”§

Of this mind were Harding, Stapleton, Sanders, Bristow, Champney, &c. formerly. See Mason's *Vindiciæ Eccles. Angl.*

The Opposition.

The Church of England.

1. Besides bishops there are but two orders, *viz.* priests and deacons.

2. Arch-bishops, bishops, priests, and deacons, are rightly, orderly, and lawfully consecrated and ordered in the Church of England.

The Church of Rome.

1. Besides bishops, and the four lesser orders, there were always three, *viz.* priests, deacons, and sub-deacons.

2. Such bishops and priests as are consecrated and ordered in the Church of England, are no bishops nor priests.

The 37th Article of the Church of England.—Of the Civil Magistrates.

“The Queen's majesty hath the chief power in this realm of England, and other her dominions, unto whom the chief government of all estates of this realm, whether they be ecclesiastical or civil, in all causes doth appertain; and is not, nor ought to be subject to any foreign jurisdiction.”||

* Catechis. par. 2. cap. 9. [cap. 7.] ss. 11, 12. [ut supra, p. 264.]

† On John x. 1.

‡ Erastus Senior Pref. Anno 1662.

§ A Paper in the Vindication of Ordination, &c. Anno 1677.

|| Art. 37.

"The bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this realm of England."

The Third Part of the Sermon of Obedience.

"The usurped power of the bishop of Rome, which he most wrongfully challengeth, as the successor of St. Peter, is false, feigned and forged.

"The bishop of Rome teacheth, that they that are under him, are free from all burdens and charges of the common-wealth, and obedience towards their prince, most clearly against Christ's doctrine, and St. Peter's. He ought therefore rather to be called Antichrist, and the successor of the scribes and pharisees, than Christ's vicar, or St. Peter's successor.

"St. Peter doth not say, submit yourselves unto me as the supreme Head of the Church; neither saith he, Submit yourselves from time to time to my successor in Rome; but saith he, Submit yourselves to the king, the supreme head."

The Second Part of the Sermon of Obedience.

"Wicked rulers have their power and authority from God, and therefore it is not lawful for their subjects to withstand them, although they abuse their power."

The Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man; set forth by Henry VIII. and compiled by Cranmer, &c.

"Subjects be bound not to withdraw their fealty, truth, love and obedience towards their prince for any cause whatsoever it be; ne for any cause they may conspire against his person, ne do any thing towards the hindrance, or hurt thereof, nor of his estate."*

Third Part of the Sermon against wilful Rebellion.

"The speedy overthrow of all rebels of what number, state, or condition soever they were, or what colour or cause soever they pretended, is and ever hath been such, that God thereby doth shew that he alloweth neither the dignity of any person, nor the multitude of any people, nor the weight of any cause as sufficient for the which the subjects may move rebellion against their princes."

See the Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy.

The Church of Rome.—§. 1. *Of the Authority claimed by the Church of Rome.*

1. "The Roman Church is the mother and mistress of all

* On 5th Commandment.

churches." So the fourth General Council of Lateran, Can. 2. The Council of Trent, Sess. 7. Can. 3, &c. This is made an article of faith in the Creed of Pope Pius IV.

2. "The Roman Bishop is the vicar of God and Christ, the successor of St. Peter, and hath the supreme pastorship over the universal Church." So the Council of Trent, Sess. 6. de Reform. cap. 1. Sess. 14. cap. 7, &c. This is also an Article of faith in the aforesaid Creed.

§ 2. *Of the Exercise of this Authority.*

1. The Church of Rome doth take upon her to command sovereign Princes. So it is the phrase of their Councils: "We do enjoin princes, we do peremptorily require kings," &c. So the 4th General Council of Later. cap. 67, 68. The 5th General Council of Later. d e Pragmat. Sanc. The Council of Trent.

2. She doth overrule what sovereign princes have commanded. So the Council of Constance: "Notwithstanding the safe-conducts granted by emperors and kings, &c. yet heretical wickedness may be inquired after, by a competent judge; and the persons guilty be punished; although they should come to the place of judgement confiding in the safe-conduct, and otherwise would not have come."*

3. The Church of Rome hath excommunicated such sovereign princes as have not submitted to what she hath commanded; and hath deposed such as have been thus excommunicated and continued refractory; and absolved their subjects from allegiance to them when deposed. So—

The 3rd General Council of Lateran.

"We do forbid under an anathema, that any one presume to keep or maintain heretics in their houses or land, or to exercise commerce with them. And if they shall die in their sin, there shall no oblation be made for them."†

"And let subjects know, that they are released from all debt of fealty and homage, and all obedience."

The 4th General Council of Lateran.

"Let secular powers, whatsoever offices they execute,‡ be admonished, persuaded, and if it be necessary, compelled by ecclesiastical censure, that as they desire to be reputed and

* Sess. 19. [Ibid. vol. 12. p. 169.]

† Cap. 17. [cap. 27.] [Ibid. vol. 10. p. 1522.]

‡ Can. 3. de Hæreticis. [Ibid. vol. 11. par. 1. p. 148.]

accounted faithful, so they would publicly take an oath for the defence of the faith, that they would endeavour in good faith, according to their power to destroy (*exterminare*) all heretics marked by the Church, out of the lands of their jurisdiction. But if the temporal Lord being required and admonished, shall neglect to purge his land from this heretical filthiness, he shall be excommunicated by his metropolitan, and the other bishops of the province. And if he shall refuse to give satisfaction within a year, let it be signified to the Pope, that he may forthwith denounce his vassals absolved from their allegiance, and expose his land to be possessed by Catholics; who, having destroyed the heretics, may possess it without contradiction, and preserve it in the purity of the faith, saving the right of the principal Lord, whilst that he doth make no hindrance to it. Nevertheless the same law is to be observed towards them who have no principal Lords."

The General Council of Lyons, Ann. 1245.

In this, Pope Innocent IV. deprived the Emperor Frederic II. after this manner: "We, after diligent deliberation had with the sacred Council, do declare and denounce, that he is deprived of all honour and dignity, and by our sentence do deprive him; and do for ever absolve them from their oath, who have sworn allegiance to him; firmly forbidding by our apostolical authority, that any one from henceforward, obey him as emperor or king, &c. And let those to whom the election belongs, freely choose a successor in that empire."*

The Council of Constance.

It is decreed,† that all that should hinder the Emperor Sigismund from meeting the King of Arragon, of what quality soever, though king, duke, &c. they be excommunicated, and deprived of all their secular honour and dignity.

And in the bull of Pope Martin V., read and approved in that Council: all professors of the Christian and Catholic faith, the emperor, kings, dukes, &c. "are required to expel all heretics out of their kingdoms and provinces, according to the canon," *sicut ait*, &c. That is, the abovesaid canon of the 3rd Lateran Council.‡

The Council of Trent.

"The emperors, kings, dukes, &c. and all temporal lords of

* Sess. 3. [Ibid. p.]

† Sess. 17. [Ibid. vol. 12. p. 161.]

‡ Sess. ult. [Ibid. p. 259.]

what title soever, who shall grant a place for duelling among Christians within their lands, shall for that cause be deprived of the dominion of the city, castle, or place in which they permitted the duel to be."*

4. The Church of Rome doth exempt the clergy from temporal jurisdiction. So—

The 3rd General Lateran Council.

"Because some laics do compel ecclesiastical persons, and also bishops themselves, to appear before their judgment-seat, we do therefore decree, that such be separated from the communion of the faithful, who shall presume from henceforward so to do."†

The 4th General Council of Lateran.

"Some laics do too much usurp upon divine right, when they do compel ecclesiastical persons, holding nothing temporal from them, to take an oath of allegiance to them. But because, according to the Apostle, the servant doth stand or fall to his own master, we do forbid, by the authority of the sacred Council, that such clerks be compelled to take this kind of oath to secular persons."‡

See further the bull of Pope Leo X. read in the 5th General Council of Lateran: and the Council of Trent, which doth ratify all canons made in their favour.§

The Opposition.

The Church of England.

1. The King hath chief power.

2. The King hath power over all persons.

3. The Bishop of Rome hath no power in the king's dominions: and the power he challengeth is usurpation.

4. The king is not to be resisted.

The Church of Rome.

1. The Pope hath power over kings, to excommunicate, depose, &c.

2. Ecclesiastical persons are exempted from secular jurisdiction.

3. The Bishop of Rome is the universal pastor.

4. The Pope can give power to resist sovereign princes, and can absolve subjects from their allegiance.

* Decret de Reform. cap. 12.

† Cap 14. [Ibid. vol. 10. p. 1516.]

‡ Can. 43. [Ibid. vol. 11. par. 1. p. 191.]

§ Sess. 9. [Ibid. vol. 14. p. 219] Sess. 25. de Reform. cap. 20. [Ibid. p. 917.]

As the opposition in this matter is evident betwixt Church and Church ; so we look upon the one to be no less the doctrine of the Church of Rome, than the other is the doctrine of the Church of England.

For, 1. It is notoriously manifest, that the Church of Rome hath both owned such principles, and proceeded according to those principles in excommunicating and deposing kings, in limiting their jurisdiction, and absolving subjects from their allegiance.

2. It is manifest, that the several branches of authority fore-recited, and claimed by that Church, are grounded upon the canons of what they call General Councils. And that all in the communion of that Church are bound to own and receive these principles, is evident, since they are decreed by the same Councils, and after the same manner as the doctrine of transubstantiation itself; and so are equally to be received with it, and by the members of that Church.

Thus far I have traced the disagreement between the Church of England and Rome, according to the order observed in the Thirty-nine Articles; and I might proceed to shew the opposition between them in many other points ; such as the sufficiency of attrition with absolution ; the necessity of auricular confession ; the adoration of the cross ; the images made of God and the Trinity ; the guardianship ascribed to angels and saints over places, professions, &c. The pilgrimages to images and relics ; the miracles pretended to be wrought by them ; the religious states of life, and their vows of poverty and obedience ; their particular ceremonies in the mass and baptism, their limbus's, &c. But this will be too tedious, and indeed somewhat unnecessary, considering how evident it has been already made, not to say with some clearness demonstrated, that there is an irreconcilable difference between the two Churches, "about those points* (to use our author's words) wherein the very life of Popery consists, and the whole system of that religion is founded." And as now I may leave it to his skill to try, whether he can with a *dictum factum*, patch up a Cassandrian peace presently between them : so I shall leave it to the reader's judgment, even those he calls the unwary readers of books, whether "we have left us nothing but the name and shadow of a Protestant Church of England,"† as he affirms ; or whether the doctrine of the Protestants be any where to be

* Agreement, Preface.

† Ibid.

found, if not in the Church of England. And for this purpose I shall present the reader with the sum of what has been said upon this argument.

A brief Scheme of the Difference betwixt the Doctrine of the Church of England, and the Church of Rome, as set forth in the foregoing Treatise.

Sufficiency of Scripture.

The Church of England teacheth.

THE holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation ; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be received as an article of faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation, p. 15.

The Church of Rome holdeth.

THE holy Scripture doth not contain all saving truth ; but there are certain traditions not written, which the Church is to have recourse to for it, as well as the written books. And such traditions are to be received, and regarded with the like piety and reverence, as the books of the Old and New Testament.

Canonical Books.

No books are to be received as canonical, but Genesis, &c, that is, the 39 books of the Old Testament and the New. And, as for the 13 books, commonly called Apocrypha, though the Church doth read them for example of life, and instruction of manners ; yet she doth not apply them to establish any doctrine.

The books commonly called Apocrypha, viz. Tobias, &c. are as canonical, and as truly the Word of God, as the five books of Moses, &c. And whosoever doth not receive them, is accursed.

Scripture in a known Tongue.

There is in Scripture, whatsoever is meet for all ages and sorts of men ; and so the books of it ought to be much in their hands, eyes and hearts. And none are enemies to the reading of it, but such

If the Scripture be permitted to be read every where in the vulgar tongue, more prejudice than benefit doth redound from it. And therefore, it is fit that the people be deprived altogether of it,

The Church of England teacheth.

as are ignorant or ungodly, that would wish the people still to continue in blindness and ignorance of God, p. 15.

The Church of Rome holdeth.

nor so much as suffered to have summaries, or historical abridgments of it.

Church Authority.

The Church, though a witness and keeper of the Holy Writ, yet ought not to decree any thing against the same, nor to enforce any thing besides the same, to be believed for necessity of salvation, p. 37.

It belongs to the Church of Rome to judge of the sense of the Scripture: and it is in her power to forbid receiving the sacrament in both kinds, though Christ so instituted and delivered it.

The Fallibility of the Church.

As the Church of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch, have erred: so also the Church of Rome hath erred, not only in their living, and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of faith: so that their claim of infallibility is but a vain brag, and nothing else, p. 31, 35.

The Church of Rome cannot err, being taught by the Holy Spirit suggesting all truth from day to day.

General Councils.

General Councils may not be gathered together, without the commandment and will of princes: and when gathered, may err, and sometimes have erred in things pertaining to God, p. 39.

It belongs to the Pope to call and direct General Councils; and being so gathered they have ever the assistance of God's Spirit, and so cannot err.

Christ the only Mediator.

Christ is the only mediator between God and man, being both God and man, in whom alone the conditions requisite in an object of worship, are to be found; whence it followeth, that we must call neither upon angel nor saint, but solely upon him, as our mediator:

There are other mediators of intercession in heaven besides Christ, such as angels and saints, and more especially the Virgin Mary, who is the mother of mercy, and advocate of the faithful; and it is good and profitable to invoke them, and to have

The Church of England teacheth.

and to make them intercessors to God, is after the Gentiles idolatrous usage, p. 19, 41, 46.

The Church of Rome holdeth.

recourse to their prayers, aid, and help. And those that deny they are to be invocated, or affirm the invocation of them is idolatry, are accursed.

Original Sin.

Original sin is the corruption of the nature of every man, naturally engendered of the offspring of Adam: and all offend in many things, Christ only excepted, p. 20, 30.

The blessed Virgin is not comprehended in the decree of original sin, and never sinned so much as venially, in all her life.

Images.

Image worship was abhorred in the Primitive Church, as abominable and contrary to all true Christian religion: and to fall down before images, &c. is to give that honour to stocks and stones, which the saints themselves refused when alive, p. 44.

The images of Christ, the Virgin Mary, and other saints, are to have due honour given to them, by kissing them, uncovering the head, falling down before them, lighting up candles to them, &c. by which Christ is adored, and the saints are venerated.

Relics.

To worship and honour the relics of saints, is to pass the folly and wickedness of the Gentiles. The Romish doctrine concerning worshipping and adoration of images and relics, is a fond thing, grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to it, p. 44.

The relics of the saints are to be venerated. And all that hold the contrary, are accursed.

Purgatory.

There are two places only in the other world, the one proper to the elect and the blessed of God; the other to the reprobate. And the souls of men passing out of the

There is a purgatory or place of torment in which the souls of good persons, not sufficiently purged, have their sins expiated, and they thereby are prepared for the kingdom

The Church of England teacheth.

body, go to heaven or hell. And the Romish doctrine concerning purgatory, is a fond thing, vainly invented and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to it, p. 41.

The Church of Rome holdeth.

of heaven. And the souls there detained, are helped by the masses, prayers, alms, and other good works of the living. And if any one shall say there is not such a place, or that there remains no guilt to be expiated by penitent persons in purgatory, or that those that are there are not helped by masses, &c. he is accursed.

Merits.

Though good works are pleasing unto God, yet to put any confidence in them as by merit, and deserving of them to purchase to ourselves or others remission of sin, and everlasting life, is mere blasphemy, and great derogation to the blood-shedding of our Saviour Jesus Christ, p. 24, 25.

Justified persons truly deserve eternal life, and the good works of such, are truly and properly meritorious, and are fully worthy of eternal life; and whosoever thinketh otherwise, is accursed.

Supererogation.

Works of supererogation, or such as are over and above God's commandment, cannot be taught without arrogancy and impiety; and it is an ungodly practice to make sale of them, and to persuade the people, that thereby the sins of other men might have satisfaction made for them, p. 27, 28.

There are works of supererogation, which are done more than precept; and a person endued with divine grace may satisfy for another, and pay in the name of another what is due to God; and the value of such works is to be so disposed of for that purpose, by such as Christ hath made dispensers of his treasures.

Indulgences.

The Romish doctrine concerning pardons, is a fond thing, vainly invented and

The Church hath a power from Christ to pardon offenders, and whatever debts,

The Church of England teacheth.

grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but is rather repugnant to it, p. 41, 42.

The Church of Rome holdeth.

here or hereafter in purgatory, a man oweth to God for the satisfaction of his sins, may be remitted by the indulgence of the Church; and whosoever saith that the Church hath no such power, or that such indulgences are unprofitable, is accursed.

Prayers in a known Tongue.

It is a thing plainly repugnant to the word of God, and the custom of the Primitive Church, to have public prayers in the Church, or to minister the sacraments in a tongue not understood of the people, p. 49.

It is fittest every where to have the mass celebrated in Latin, or a tongue not understood by the people; and it is for that reason so enjoined. And whosoever saith it ought to be otherwise, is accursed.

Sacraments.

There are only two sacraments ordained of Christ, *viz.* baptism, and the supper of the Lord; and the other five commonly called sacraments in the Church of Rome, are not sacraments, being such as have grown partly of the corrupt following of the Apostles (as extreme unction, &c.) partly are states of life allowed of in Scripture (as matrimony), but have not the like nature of sacraments with the other, p. 50.

The sacraments instituted by Christ, are no fewer than seven, *viz.* baptism, confirmation, the eucharist, penance, extreme unction, orders, and matrimony. And whosoever shall say, that they are more or fewer than seven, or that any of these seven is not truly and properly a sacrament, is accursed.

Opus Operatum.

The Sacraments have a wholesome effect or operation in such only as worthily receive them, p. 50.

The Sacraments do confer grace, *ex opere operato*, by the work done; and if any say otherwise, they are accursed.

Solitary Masses.

There is to be no celebration

Those masses are to be ap-

The Church of England teacheth.

of the Lord's supper, except there be a convenient number to communicate with the priest.
Ibid.

The Church of Rome holdeth.

proved and commended, where the priest communicates alone: and if any one shall say such are unlawful, and to be abrogated, he is accursed.

Transubstantiation.

Transubstantiation, or the change of the substance of the bread and wine into the very substance of the body and blood of Christ, is repugnant to the Scripture, and overthroweth the nature of a sacrament, p. 52.

The sacramental bread and wine remain in their very natural substances; and the natural body and blood of Christ are in heaven, and not here.

There is a transubstantiation, or a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood, of Christ: and whoso denies them is accursed.

The species only of bread and wine remain in the Eucharist; and the body and blood of Christ, together with his soul and divinity, and so whole Christ, are contained therein: and whoso denieth it, is accursed.

The Body of Christ.

The wicked, and such as be void of a lively faith, in no wise partake of Christ, p. 55.

And the body of Christ is taken and eaten only after an heavenly and spiritual manner; and the mean whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten, is faith, p. 52.

Ill men receive the body and blood of Christ, be they infidels or ill-livers.

Christ is not only eaten spiritually; and whosoever shall so affirm is accursed.

Sacrament in both kinds.

The cup is not to be denied to the lay people; for both the parts of the sacrament ought, by Christ's ordinance, to be ministered to all, p. 55, 56.

Though Christ instituted the sacrament in both kinds, yet it is to be administered in one: and whosoever shall say that it ought by God's command to be received in both, or that the Church hath not

The Church of England teacheth.

The sacrament of the Lord's supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, and worshipped; and no adoration ought to be done thereunto, p. 52.

The Church of Rome holdeth.

for just reasons required it to be in one kind, &c. he is accursed.

Adoration of the Host.

Christ is to be worshipped in the Eucharist with divine worship, and to be solemnly carried about, and to be shewed to the people, that he may be worshipped: and whosoever doth deny this, or saith that the worshippers are idolators, is accursed.

The Sacrifice of the Mass.

The sacrifice of the mass, in which it is commonly said the priest offers for the quick and dead, to have remission of pain and guilt, are blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits, p. 57.

In the sacrifice performed in the mass, the self-same Christ is contained, and unbloody offered, that offered himself on the cross; and this sacrifice is truly propitiatory, and is rightly offered for the sins, punishments, and satisfactions of the living and dead: and if any one shall deny this, and say it is blasphemy, he is accursed.

Traditions and Ceremonies.

The burden of ceremonies in the Romish Church is intolerable for their excess and multitude, and, by reason of their obscurity, they more confound than set forth Christ's benefits to us, and deface the plain, simple, and sincere religion of Christ; and as they are vain in themselves, so are abused to gross superstition, p. 33, 61.

The ceremonies used in the mass, &c. are of apostolical tradition and institution, and which serve for the majesty of so great a sacrifice, and are for the exciting of the faithful; and though they are many, yet none of them is to be esteemed needless and vain: and if any one shall say that they are rather incitements to impiety than helps to piety, he is accursed.

The Church of England teacheth.

The Church of Rome holdeth.

Of the Consecration of Bishops, &c.

There are no other orders in the Church than bishops, priests, and deacons.

There are seven orders in the Church, bishops, priests, deacons, acolythi, exorcists, readers, the door-keepers, sub-deacon, deacon, and priest.

And these are rightly consecrated and ordered in the Church of England, p. 63.

Those consecrated and ordained out of the Church of Rome, are no bishops or pastors, but thieves and murderers, p. 64.

Priests' Marriage.

Bishops, priests, and deacons may lawfully marry, and are not commanded by God's law, either to vow the estate of single life, or to abstain from marriage; and therefore the monastical vow of single life, accounted the highest state of perfection, is the leaven of man's feigned religion, and abominable to God, p. 59.

It is not lawful for bishops, priests, and deacons to marry; and if married, they are to be separated, and to be brought to penance: and if any one shall say, that such as have professed chastity may contract matrimony, or that such matrimony is valid, because they have not the gift of chastity, he is accursed.

The Supremacy.

The King in all his realms hath supreme power, in all causes, whether ecclesiastical or civil; and the Bishop of Rome hath therein no jurisdiction, and can release none from subjection to their prince: for God alloweth neither the dignity of any person, nor the multitude of any people, nor the weight of any cause, as sufficient for the which subjects may rebel, p. 65.

The Pope is the vicar of Christ, successor of St. Peter, and the supreme Pastor over all the world: he may command sovereign princes, overrule what they command, excommunicate and depose them, if they contradict his commands; and absolve their subjects from allegiance, and exempt the clergy from their jurisdiction, p. 67, 70.

The power the Bishop of Rome challengeth as the suc-

Lastly, The Church of Rome doth hold all things delivered,

The Church of England teacheth.
cessor of St. Peter, is false
and feigned.

The Church of Rome holdeth.
defined, and declared by the
sacred canons, and general
Councils, and especially that
of Trent, &c. : and that this
is the true Catholic faith, out
of which none can be saved.
[Creed of Pius IV.]

THE
DOCTRINES AND PRACTICES
OF THE
CHURCH OF ROME, TRULY REPRESENTED :

IN ANSWER TO A BOOK, INTITULED,
A PAPIST MISREPRESENTED, AND REPRESENTED, ETC.

AN ANSWER TO THE INTRODUCTION.

THE introduction consists of two parts :

I. A general complaint of the Papists being misrepresented among us.

II. An account of the method he hath taken to clear them from these misrepresentations.

I. As to the first ; whether it be just, or not, must be examined in the several particulars. But here we must consider, whether it serves the end it is designed for in this place, which is, to gain the reader's good opinion of their innocency : not merely because they complain so much of being injured, but because the best men in all times have been misrepresented ; as he proves at large in this introduction, from several examples of the Old and New Testament, but especially of Christ and his Apostles, and the primitive Christians. But it is observable, that when Bp. Jewel began his excellent Apology for the Church of England, with a complaint much of the same nature, and produced the very same examples, his adversary would by no means allow it to have any force, being as he called it, *exordium commune*, which might be used on both sides, and therefore could be proper to neither. And although it be reasonable only for those to complain of being misrepresented, who having truth on their side, do notwithstanding suffer under the imputation of error ; yet it is possible for those who are very much mistaken, to complain of being misrepresented ; and while they go about to remove the misrepresentations of others, to make new ones of their own. And

as the best men, and the best things, have been misrepresented ; so other men have been as apt to complain of it, and the worst things are as much misrepresented, when they are made to appear not so bad as they are. For evil is as truly misrepresented under the appearance of good, as good under the appearance of evil ; and it is hard to determine whether hath done the greater mischief.

So that if the father of lies be the author of misrepresenting (as the introduction begins), we must have a care of him both ways. For when he tried this black art in paradise (as our author speaks), it was both by misrepresenting the command, and the danger of transgressing it. He did not only make the command appear otherwise than it was, but he did very much lessen the punishment of disobedience, and by that means deluded our first parents into that sin and misery under which their posterity still suffers. Which ought to be a caution to them, how dangerous it is to break the law of God under the fairest colour and pretences ; and that they should not be easily imposed upon by false glosses, and plausible representations, though made by such as therein pretend to be angels of light.

But although the father of lies be the author of misrepresenting : yet we have no reason to think but that if he were to plead his own cause to mankind, he would very much complain of being misrepresented by them ; and even in this respect, when they make him the father of those lies which are their own inventions. And can that be a certain argument of truth, which may as well be used by the father of lies ?

And the great instruments he hath made use of in deceiving and corrupting mankind, have been as forward as any to complain of being misrepresented. The true reason is, because no great evil can prevail in the world, unless it be represented otherwise than it is ; and all men are not competent judges of the colours of good and evil ; therefore when the designs of those who go about to deceive, begin to be laid open, they then betake themselves to the fairest representations they can make of themselves, and hope that many will not see through their pretences.

If I had a mind to follow our author's method, I could make as long a deduction of instances of this kind. But I shall content myself with some few examples of those who are allowed on both sides to have been guilty of great errors and corruption.

The Arians pleaded they were misrepresented, when they

were taken for enemies to Christ's divinity ; for all that they contended for, was only such a moment of time, as would make good the relation between Father and Son.

The Pelagians, with great success for some time (and even at Rome), complained, that they were very much misrepresented as enemies to God's grace ; whereas they owned and asserted the manifold grace of God ; and were only enemies to men's idleness and neglect of their duties.

The Nestorians gave out, that they never intended to make two persons in Christ, as their adversaries charged them ; but, all their design was to avoid blasphemy, in calling the blessed Virgin the mother of God ; and whatever went beyond this was their adversaries' misrepresentations, and not their own opinions.

The Eutychians thought themselves very hardly dealt with, for saying there was but one nature in Christ : they did not mean thereby (as they said) to destroy the properties of the human nature, but only to assert that its substance was swallowed up by the Divine ; and of all persons, those have no reason to blame them, who suppose the properties of one substance may be united to another.

Even the Gentile idolaters, when they were charged by the Christians that they worshipped stocks and stones, complained they were misrepresented, for they were not such idiots to take things for gods which had neither life, nor sense, nor motion in them. And when they were charged with worshipping other gods than the Supreme, they desired their sense might not be taken from common prejudices, or vulgar practices, but from the doctrine of their philosophers ; and they owned a sovereign worship due to him that was chief ; and a subordinate and relative to some celestial beings, whom they made application to as mediators between him and them. Must all these complaints now be taken for granted ? what then becomes of the reputation of general Councils, or the primitive Christians ? But as, if it were enough to be accused, none would be innocent ; so none would be guilty, if it were enough to complain of being misrepresented.

Therefore in all complaints of this nature it is necessary to come to particulars, and to examine with care and diligence the matters complained of, and then to give judgment in the case. I am glad to find our author professing so much sincerity and truth without passion ; and I do assure him I shall follow what he professes : for the cause of our Church is such as needs

neither tricks nor passion to defend it, and therefore I shall endeavour to state the matters in difference with all the clearness and calmness that may be, and I shall keep close to his method and representations, without digressions or provoking reflections.

II. But I must declare myself very much unsatisfied with the method he has taken to clear his party from these misrepresentations. For,

1. He takes upon him to draw a double character of a Papist; and in the one he pretends to follow a certain rule, but not in the other, which is not fair and ingenuous.

As to the one, he saith, he follows the Council of Trent, and their allowed spiritual books and catechisms: and we find no fault with this. But why must the other part then be drawn by fancy, or common prejudices, or ignorant mistakes? Have we no rule whereby the judgment of our Church is to be taken? Are not our Articles as easy to be had and understood, as the decrees and canons of the Council of Trent? I will not ask, how the Council of Trent comes to be the rule and measure of doctrine to any here, where it was never received? But I hope I may, why our representations are not to be taken from the sense of our Church, as theirs from the Council of Trent? If he saith, his design was to remove common prejudices and vulgar mistakes; it is easy to answer, if they are contrary to the doctrine of our Church we utterly disown them. We know very well there are persons who have so false a notion of Popery, that they charge the rites and customs of our Church with it: but we pity their weakness and folly, and are far from defending such misrepresentations. But that which we adhere to is the doctrine and sense of our Church, as it is by law established; and what representations are made agreeable thereto, I undertake to defend, and no other. But if a person take the liberty to lay on what colours he pleases on one side, it will be no hard matter to take them off in the other, and then to say, how much fairer is our Church than she is painted! It is an easy but not so allowable a way of disputing, for the same person to make the objections and answers too; for he may so model and frame the arguments by a little art, that the answers may appear very full and sufficient, whereas, if they had been truly represented, they would be found very lame and defective.

2. He pretends to give an account why he quotes no authors for his misrepresentations, which is very unsatisfactory, *viz.*

“that he hath described the Papist therein, exactly according to the apprehension he had of him when he was a Protestant.” But how can we tell what sort of Protestant he was; nor how instructed in his religion? And must the character now supposed to be common to Protestants be taken from his ignorant, or childish, or wilful mistakes? Did ever any Protestant that understands himself say, “that Papists are never permitted to hear sermons which they are able to understand (p. 58), or that they held it lawful to commit idolatry (p. 9), or that a Papist believes the Pope to be his great God, and to be far above all angels, &c.?” Yet these are some of his misrepresentations (p. 40). Did he in earnest think so himself? If he did, he gives no good account of himself; if he did not, he gives a worse; for then how shall we believe him in other things when he saith, “he hath drawn his misrepresentations exactly according to his own apprehensions.” It is true, he saith, “he added some few points which were violently charged on him by his friends:” but we dare be bold to say this was none of them. But let us suppose it true that he had such apprehensions himself: are these fit to be printed as the character of a party? What would they say to us if a Spanish convert should give a character of Protestants according to the common opinion the people there had of them; and set down in one column their monstrous misrepresentations, and in another, what he found them to be since his coming hither; and that in good truth he saw they were just like other men. But suppose he had false apprehensions before he went among them; why did he not take care to inform himself better before he changed? Had he no friends, no books, no means to rectify his mistakes? must he needs leave one Church and go to another, before he understood either? If this be a true account of himself, it is but a bad account of the reasons of his change.

3. The account he gives of the other part of his character, affords as little satisfaction; for although, in the general, it be well that he pretends to keep to a rule, yet,

(1.) He shews no authority he hath to interpret that rule in his own sense. Now several of his representations depend upon his own private sense and opinions, against the doctrine of many others as zealous for their Church as himself; and what reason have we to adhere to his representation, rather than to theirs? As for instance, he saith, “the Pope’s personal infallibility is no matter of faith,” (p. 42.) But there are others say it is, and is grounded on the same promises

which makes him Head of the Church. Why now must we take his representation rather than theirs? And so as to the deposing power, he grants, "it hath been the opinion of several Popes (and Councils too), but that it is no matter of faith," (p. 47.) But whose judgment are we to take in this matter, according to the principles of their Church? A private man's, of no name, no authority, or of those Popes and Councils? But suppose the question be about the sense of his own rule, the Council of Trent:* what authority hath he to declare it, when the Pope hath expressly forbidden all prelates to do it, and reserved it to the apostolical see?

(2.) He leaves out, in the several particulars, an essential part of the character of a Papist since the Council of Trent; which is, that he doth not only believe the doctrines there defined to be true, but to be necessary to salvation. And there is not a word of this in his representation of the points of doctrine, but the whole is managed as though there were nothing but a difference about some particular opinions; whereas, in truth, the necessity of holding those doctrines, in order to salvation, is the main point in difference. If men have no mind to believe their own senses, we know not how to help it; but we think it is very hard to be told, we cannot be saved unless we renounce them too. And this now appears to be the true state of the case since Pius IV. drew up and published a Confession of Faith, according to the decrees and canons of the Council of Trent, wherein men are not only required to believe their traditions as firmly as the Bible, the seven sacraments, transubstantiation, the sacrifice of the mass, purgatory, invocation of saints, worshipping of images, indulgences, supremacy, &c., but they must believe, that without believing these things there is no salvation to be had in the ordinary way; for after the enumeration of those points it follows, *Hanc veram Catholicam fidem, extra quam nemo salvus esse potest, &c.* This is the true Catholic faith without which no man can be saved; *i. e.* the belief of these things is thereby declared as necessary to salvation, as of any other articles of the creed. But it may be objected, the subscribing this profession of faith, is not required of all members of that Church. To which I answer, that to make a man a member of it he must declare that he holds the same faith which the Church of Rome holds:

* Bulla Pii 4ti super Confirm. Concil. Tridentini. [Labbe, Concil. vol. 14. p. 941.]

and this is as much the faith of the Roman Church as the Pope and Council of Trent could make it. And it is now printed in the Roman Ritual at Paris, set forth by Paul V. as the confession of faith owned by the Church of Rome, and therefore this ought to have been a part of the true representation, as to the doctrinal points: but when he comes to the thirty-fifth head, he then owns, "that unless men do believe every article of the Roman faith, they cannot be saved (p. 96), and he that disbelieves one does in a manner disbelieve all (p. 97)." Which may as well reach those who disown the deposing power, and the Pope's personal infallibility, as us, since those are accounted articles of faith by the ruling part of their Church, to whom it chiefly belongs to declare them; and the former hath been defined both by Popes and Councils.

(3.) He never sets down what it is which makes any doctrine to become a doctrine of their Church. We are often blamed for charging particular opinions upon their Church; but we desire to know what it is which makes a doctrine of their Church; *i. e.* whether frequent and public declaration, by the heads and guides of their Church, be sufficient or not to that end? Our author seems to imply the necessity of some conditions to be observed; for besides the Pope's authority, he requires due circumstances, and proceeding according to law (p. 42). But who is to be judge of these circumstances and legal proceedings? And he never tells what these circumstances are. And yet after all, he saith, "The orders of the supreme pastor are to be obeyed, whether he be infallible or not." And this now brings the matter home; the Popes, he confesses, have owned the deposing doctrine, and acted according to it: and others are bound to obey their orders, whether infallible or not; and consequently they are bound by the doctrine of their Church to act, when the Pope shall require it, according to the deposing power. But he seems to say, in this case, that a doctrine of their Church is to be judged by the number; for, saith he, there are greater numbers that disown this doctrine (p. 47). I will not at present dispute it; but I desire to be informed, whether the doctrines of their Church go by majority of votes or not? I had thought the authority of the guides of the Church ought to have over-balanced any number of dissenters. For, what are those who refuse to submit to the dictates of Popes and Councils, but dissenters from the Church of Rome? The distinction of the Court and

Church of Rome is wholly impertinent in this case : for, we here consider not the mere temporal power which makes the Court, but the spiritual capacity of teaching the Church : and if Popes and Councils may err in teaching this doctrine, why not in any other ? I know there are some that say, universal tradition is necessary to make a doctrine of their Church. But then no submission can be required to any doctrine in that Church, till the universal tradition of it, in all times, and in all parts of the Christian Church, be proved. And we need to desire no better terms than these, as to all points of Pope Pius IV.'s creed, which are in dispute between us and them.

(4.) He makes use of the authority of some particular divines, as delivering the sense of their Church, when there are so many of greater authority against them. Whereas, if we proceed by his own rule, the greater number is to carry it. Therefore we cannot be thought to misrepresent them, if we charge them with such things as are owned, either by the general and allowed practices of their Church, or their public offices, or the generality of their divines and casuists ; or in case of a contest, with that side which is owned by the guides of their Church, when the other is censured ; or which was approved by their canonized saints, or declared by their Popes and Councils, whose decrees they are bound to follow. And by these measures I intend to proceed, having no design to misrepresent them, as indeed we need not.

And so much in answer to the introduction.

I. *Of Praying to Images.*

In this, and the other particulars, where it is necessary, I shall observe this method :

1. To give a clear and impartial account of the state of the controversy in as few words as I can.

2. To make some reflections on what he saith, in order to the clearing them from misrepresentations.

As to the state of this controversy, as it stands since the Council of Trent, we are to consider :

1. We must distinguish between what persons do in their own opinion, and what they do according to the sense of the divine law. It is possible that men may intend one thing, and the law give another sense of it : as is often seen in the case of treason ; although the persons plead never so much they had no intention to commit treason, yet if the law makes their act to be so, their disavowing it doth not excuse them. So it is in the present case ; men may have real and serious inten-

tions to refer their final, ultimate, and sovereign worship only to God; but if the law of God strictly and severely prohibits this particular manner of worship by images, in as full, plain, and clear words as may be, and gives a denomination to such acts, taken from the immediate object of it; no particular intention of the persons can alter that denomination, or make the guilt to be less than the law makes it.

2. There can be no misrepresenting as to the lawfulness of many external acts of worship, with respect to images, which are owned by them. But it doth not look fairly to put the title, "Of praying to Images;" for the question is, about the worship of images: whereas this title would insinuate as though we did directly charge them with praying to their images, without any farther respect. Which we are so far from charging them with, that I do not know of any people in the world, who are not like stones and stocks themselves, who are liable to that charge. The *Pendets* in the East Indies are fully cleared from it by Thevenot* as well as Bernier. And it would be hard we should not allow the same to our fellow Christians. I do therefore grant what our author saith, *viz.* "that all the veneration they express before images, whether by kneeling, praying, lifting up the eyes, burning candles, incense, &c. is not at all done for the image, but is wholly referred to the things represented, which he intends to honour by these actions."† But I hope now, it is no misrepresenting for us to say, that they do kneel, pray, lift up their eyes, burn candles, incense, &c. before their images; which is all I charge them with at present.

3. To perform these acts before images, without a design to worship the images by them, is declared by great divines of the Church of Rome, to be next to heresy. The case was this: there were before the Council of Trent, several persons who lived in communion of that Church, but by no means approved the worship of images, such as Durandus, Holcot, Picus Mirandula, and others. Now these persons thought fit to comply in these external acts, but declared they intended not to worship the images, but the objects before them. Since the Council of Trent decreed images were to be worshipped, this case has been debated by the divines and casuists of greatest reputation among them. And Suarez saith,‡ "this

* Thevenot Voyage des Indes, p. 188. Bernier Memoirs, tom. 3. p. 172.

† Page 3.

‡ Suarez in 3 part. Qu. 25. Disp. 53. [Disp. 54.] [vol. 16. p. 683. col. 1. Venet. 1745.]

way of Durandus is dangerous, rash, and savours of heresy ;” and he saith further from Medina,* “ that it was Victoria’s opinion that it was heretical ;” but he adds, that his own opinion, that images were truly and properly to be worshipped, was generally received by their divines ; and therefore I need name no more.

It is granted by their divines and casuists, that the people in the worship of images may easily fall into idolatry.

1. If the worship do not pass from the image to the thing represented. And so Aquinas himself determines, that no irrational creature is capable of worship, but as it hath respect to a rational being. But here lies the difficulty, how an extrin-sical relation to an object of worship where the thing is confessed to deserve none, can give any reason for its being properly worshipped. But they all grant, if the worship stop at the inanimate part, it can be no other than the worship of stocks and stones.

2. If the worship be given to the image which is proper to God alone. This Bellarmine† is forced to grant, because the evidence is so clear in antiquity, that the Gnostics were condemned for some worship which they performed to the image of Christ. Now, we cannot think that these Gnostics were such sots as to take the image of Christ to be Christ himself ; and therefore whatever worship it was, it must be relative, *i.e.* given to the image for the sake of Christ represented by it.

3. If the people believe any divinity to be in the images, or put any trust or confidence in them, then the Council of Trent‡ itself owns such to be like the heathen idolaters. Now, how shall it be known when the people believe divinity to be in images, but by some more than ordinary presence or operation in or by them ? by their having a greater opinion of one image than of another of the same person ? by their going long pilgrimages to certain images in hopes of relief, when they might easily cause images to represent them at home ?

And that such are no extravagant imaginations is known to all who have heard of Loretto or Compostella, or other places nearer home. I need not mention the complaints of Polydore Virgil, Cassander, or Wicelius to this purpose, who died all in

* Sect. 3. 2do. Principaliter et sect. 5. [Ibid. p. 682. col. 1. p. 692. col. 2, &c.]

† Bellarmin. de Imag. l. 2. c. 24.

‡ Concil. Trident. Sess. 25. [Labbe, ut supra, p. 895.]

the communion of the Church of Rome; for the same is very lately complained of by a considerable person in that communion, who saith, "the greatest part of the devotion of the people of Italy, Spain, and Portugal consists in prostrating themselves before images, and going in pilgrimage to them, and hoping for the remission of their sins by so doing."* And another very lately yields, "that to avoid the peril of idolatry, to which (he saith) the people is evidently exposed by the use of images, it would be necessary to take them away from the altars, and by no means to have them allowed for the objects of religious worship."†

The question now is, whether the Council of Trent hath taken any effectual course to prevent these abuses? If not, what misrepresenting is it to charge the abuses upon the doctrines and practices allowed by it?

The remedies prescribed by the Council are these:

1. Declaring that there is no divinity or virtue in them for which they should be worshipped; and that nothing is to be desired of them, nor any trust or confidence to be put in them.
2. Expressing their earnest desire, that if any abuses have crept in, they may be removed.

But in the meantime the Council decrees, "the images not only to be useful to be set up in churches, but to have due honour and worship given them there, for the sake of those they represent; as not only putting off the hat, but falling down before them." And the Roman Catechism‡ declares, "that this worship is very beneficial to the people, and so much is to be told them; and that images are to be in churches, not merely for instruction, *sed ut colantur*, that they may be worshipped."

But what could the Council do more than to desire all abuses may be taken away; and is it not then the fault of others, and not of the Council, if they be not?"

I grant, the Council doth desire abuses may be taken away, if any such be; but then it enumerates those abuses, in heterodox images, in making gain of images, in painting them too wantonly; but besides, it doth say, that all superstition be removed in the sacred use of images: but it doth not say in the worship of them; and so it may relate to magic and divination.

* Moyens Surs et honestes pour la Conversion de tous les Heretiques, to. 2. p. 115.

† Entretiens de Philalethe et Philereene, 2d part. p. 15.

‡ Catechis. Rom. Part. 3. c. 2. s. 14.

But that the Council could not prevent, or design to prevent the abuses mentioned in the worship of images, will appear by these things.

1. The Council of Trent allows the highest relative worship to be given to them; it setting no bounds to it, so it be for the sake of the prototypes.

2. It allows a worship to be given to the images themselves too; for it confirms the second Council of Nice, which decreed an inferior adoration to be given to them.

3. It disapproves no customs then practised among them in the worship of images; which were all known, and by many complained of, both as pilgrimages to them, and the carrying of them about in procession, and the solemn consecration of them; the form whereof is not only inserted, but enlarged in the new Pontifical since the Council of Trent. And it is to be observed, that in the old Pontifical, A. D. 1511, there is no form for consecrating an image; in that of Paul III. it is inserted, but out of Durandus; but in that of Clement VIII. it is put in more largely, and as authentically as if it had been always there. And is not this the way to reform the worship of images?

To come now to our author's reflections on the misrepresentation he saith hath been made as to this point.

1. "A Papist represented, believes it damnable to worship stocks and stones for gods; to pray to pictures or images of Christ, the Virgin Mary, or other saints."

These expressions are capable of a double sense, and therefore this is not fair representing.

(1.) To worship stocks or stones for gods may signify two things. 1. To believe the very stocks and stones to be gods. And this we do not charge them with. 2. To give to images made of wood and stone, the worship due only to God; and so by construction of the fact, to make them gods, by giving them divine worship. And if they will clear themselves of this, they must either prove that external adoration is no part of divine worship (notwithstanding the Scripture makes it so, and all the rest of mankind look upon it as such, even Jews, Turks, and infidels), or that their external adoration hath no respect to the images (which is contrary to the Council of Trent), or that divine worship being due to the being represented, it may be likewise given to the image. And how then could the Gnostics be condemned for giving divine worship to the image of Christ, which Bellarmine confesses; and

is affirmed by Irenæus, Epiphanius, St. Augustine, and Damascen?

(2.) To pray to images of Christ, or the blessed Virgin, may likewise be taken in two senses. 1. To pray to them, so as to expect to be heard by the mere images, and so we do not charge them with it. 2. To pray to them, so as to expect to be rather heard by themselves for praying to them by their images. And if this be not so, to what end are the prayers made in the consecration of images, for those that shall pray before them? To what purpose do so many go in long pilgrimages to certain images, if they do not hope to be better heard for praying there?

But he goes on, 2. "He keeps them by him indeed, to keep in his mind the memory of the things represented by them." And is this all in good truth? We will never quarrel with them, if this be true representing. No, that he dares not say.

But, 3. "He is taught to use them," p. 2. But how? "by casting his eye upon the pictures or images, and thence to raise his heart to the prototypes." And is this all yet? No.

But, 4. He finds a double conveniency in the use of them. (1.) "They represent at one glance;" and men may easily make good reflections, as upon the sight of a death's head, or old Time painted with his forelock, hour-glass and scythe. And will he undertake, that images shall be used in churches for no other end? Was the picture of old Time ever consecrated, or placed upon the altar, or elsewhere, that it might be worshipped? as the Roman Catechism speaks of their images. (2.) "They cure distractions; for they call back his wandering thoughts to the right object." What is this right object? the image, or the person represented? And that must be either a creature or God himself. If it be a creature, doth not this imply that it is made a right object of worship? If God himself, how doth an image cure our distraction, in the worship of an infinite invisible being; when the very image is most apt to distract our thoughts by drawing them down from his divine and adorable perfections, to the gross and mean representations of an image. But are we yet come to the utmost use of them? No.

But, 5. "He cannot but love, honour, and respect the images themselves, for the sake of those they represent." Will this content them? And will he promise to go no further? It is hard to part upon terms of mere respect and decent regard, where there is no encroachment upon divine worship. And here we are at a stand.

But he goes further, 6. And so he is come at last, "to veneration before images." And is this all? Dares he deny "veneration to images?" When the Council of Trent hath determined it, *Eisque venerationem impertiendam*. What is this veneration before images only? Bellarmine hath a chapter on purpose to prove, that true and proper worship is to be given to images. And was he a misrepresenter? Suarez saith, "It is an article of faith, that worship is to be given to them." But if the veneration be only before them, why are they consecrated, and set up in places proper for adoration?

But, 7. To satisfy any one that he is far from making gods of his images, he is ready to break them into a thousand pieces. What, a consecrated image? Dares he take a crucifix from the altar and tear it in pieces? This doth not look like the love, honour, and respect he mentioned before, not to name veneration. And I am afraid this is a strain beyond true representing. Yet at length he hath found some pretty parallels for the veneration of images themselves; and so we are come at last to the main point. But this is not directly owned; yet in the way of his representing, it is fairly insinuated by his parallels.

1. "A Christian loves and honours his neighbour, because he bears the image of God in his soul." But doth he therefore take him and set him before him when he kneels at his devotion, to raise his mind, and cure his distractions? Would he set him upon the altar, and burn incense before him, because of the image of God in him? Is there no difference between the object of Chaistian love, and of divine worship? Nor between a spiritual invisible divine image in the souls of men, and a material and corporeal representation?

2. "We may kiss and esteem the Bible, because it contains and represents to us God's word." But when we kiss and esteem the Bible, we remember the second commandment is in it; and we dare not break God's law, when we pretend to honour his word. But we think there is some difference between reverence and respect to the Bible, and falling down before an image. The circumstances of the one declare it to be mere respect, and a religious decency; and if the other be not external adoration, we know not what it is.

3. "A good preacher is loved, because he minds men of their duty." But what should we say to him that should therefore kneel down and say his prayers, and burn candles and incense before him, out of a respect to his good doctrine? Did St. Peter, or St. Paul like this, when men would have worshipped them?

A good preacher would tell them their duty, as they did; and take men off from the worship of any creature, animate or inanimate, and direct them to worship God alone, who made heaven and earth.

II. *Of Worshipping Saints.*

For the clear stating this controversy, these things are to be premised.

1. We do not charge them, that they make gods of dead men, *i. e.* that they believe the saints to be independent deities. For this our author confesses were a most damnable idolatry.

2. We do not say, that the state of the Church of Rome, with respect to the worship of dead men, is as bad as heathenism. For we acknowledge the true saints and martyrs to have been, not only good and virtuous, but extraordinary persons; in great favour with God, and highly deserving our esteem and reverence as well as imitation; whereas the heathen deified men, were vile and wicked men, and deserved not the common esteem of mankind, according to the accounts themselves give of them. And we own the common doctrine and advantages of Christianity to be preserved in the Church of Rome.

3. We do not deny, that they do allow some external acts of worship to be so proper to God alone, that they ought to be given to none else besides him. And this they call *latria*; and we shall never dispute with them about the proper signification of a word, when the sense is agreed, unless they draw inferences from it which ought not to be allowed. To this *latria*, they refer not only sacrifice, but all that relates to it, as temples, altars, and priests; so that by their own confession, to make these immediately and properly to the honour of any saint, is to make a god of that saint, and to commit idolatry.

4. They confess, that to pray to saints to bestow spiritual or temporal gifts upon us, were to give to them the worship proper to God, who is the only giver of all good things. For else I do not understand, why they should take so much pains to let us know, that whatever the forms of their prayers and hymns are, yet the intention and spirit of the Church, is only to desire them to pray for us, and to obtain things for us by their intercession with God.

But two things cannot be denied by them.

1. That they do use solemn invocation of saints in places of divine worship, at the same time they make their addresses to God himself, with all the circumstances of external adoration,

with bended knees, and eyes lifted up to heaven; and that this practice is according to the Council of Trent, which not only decrees a humble invocation of them, but declares it to be impiety to condemn mental and vocal supplication to the saints in heaven.*

2. That they do own making the saints in heaven to be their mediators of intercession, but not of redemption; although Christ be our mediator in both senses.

And upon these two points, this controversy depends.

Let us now see what our Representer saith to them.

1. "His Church teaches him indeed, and he believes that it is good and profitable to desire the intercession of the saints reigning with Christ in heaven;† but that they are either gods, or his redeemers, he is no where taught, but detests all such doctrine."

There are two ways of desiring the intercession of others for us.

1. By way of friendly request, as an act of mutual charity; and so, no doubt, we may desire others here on earth to pray for us.

2. By way of humble supplication, with all the external acts of adoration; and we cannot think St. Peter, or St. Paul, who refused any thing like adoration from men, would have been pleased to have seen men fall down upon their knees before them; and in the same posture of devotion in which they were praying to almighty God, to put their names into the middle of their Litanies, and so pray them then to pray for them.

But how are we sure that their Church teaches no more than this? I have read over and over the Council of Trent, and the Roman Catechism about it, and I can find no such limitation of their sense there, where, if any where it ought to be found. The Council of Trent mentions both the prayers, and the help and assistance of the saints which they are to fly to. If this help and assistance be no more than their prayers, why is it mentioned as distinct? Why is their reigning together with Christ in heaven spoken of, but to let us understand they have a power to help and assist? For what is their reigning to their praying for us? But I have a further argument to prove the Council meant more; *viz.* the Council knew the common practices and forms of invocation then used and allowed, and the

* Sect. 25. [Sess. 25.] [Labbe, Concil. ut supra.]

† Pag. 4.

general opinion that the saints had power to help and assist those who prayed to them. If the Council did not approve this, why did it insert the very words upon which that practice was grounded? They likewise very well knew the complaints which had been made of these things; and some of their own communion cried shame upon some of their hymns. Wicelius saith,* one of them, *Salve Regina*, &c. is full of downright impiety, and horrible superstition, and that others are wholly inexcusable.† Lud. Vives had said, "He found little difference in the people's opinion of their saints in many things from what the heathens had of their gods." These things were known, and it was in their power to have redressed them, by declaring what the sense of the Council was, and that whatever forms were used, no more was to be understood by them, but praying to them to pray for them. Besides, the Council of Trent, in the very same session, took care about reforming the Missal and Breviary; why was no care taken to reform these prayers and hymns, which they say are not to be construed by the sense of the words, but by the sense of the Church? There was time enough taken for doing it; for the reformed Missal was not published till six years after the Council, nor the Breviary till four. In all that time, the prayers and hymns might easily have been altered to the sense of the Church, if that were truly so. But instead of that, a very late French writer cries out of the necessity of reforming the Breviaries as to these things; wherein he confesses,‡ "Many hymns are still remaining, wherein those things are asked of saints, which ought to be asked of God alone; as being delivered from the chains of our sins, being preserved from spiritual maladies and hell-fire; being inflamed with charity, and made fit for heaven. In good conscience, saith he, is not this joining the saints with God himself, to ask those things of them which God alone can give?" And whatever men talk of the sense of the Church, he confesses, the very forms, and natural sense of the words, do raise another idea in men's minds; which ought to be prevented.

But doth not the Roman Catechism explain this to be the sense of the Church? I have examined that too, with all the care I could, about this matter. And I cannot find any neces-

* Wicel. in Elencho Abusu. [Fascic. Rer. Exp. et Fug. vol. 2. p. 747. Lond. 1690.]

† Vives in Aug. de Civit. Dei, 1. 8. c. 27. [fol. 106. p. 2. col. 2. Par. 1544.]

‡ Entretiens de Philalethe & Philereene. Part 2. p. 160. 153. 165.

sity from thence of putting this sense upon them. I grant in one place, where it explains the difference of the invocation of God and saints, it saith, "We are to pray to God as the giver, and to saints that they would obtain things of God for us;"* and then it adds, "the forms differ, that to God is *Miserere nobis* and *Audi nos*; that to saints is, *Ora pro nobis*." Very well! And is there then no other form owned or allowed in the Church of Rome to saints besides this? Hold a little, saith the Catechism, for it is lawful to make use of another form; and that is, we may pray to saints too, *Ut nostri misereantur*. And how doth this now differ from that to God, but only in number? But it adds, that the saints are very pitiful; then surely we are encouraged to pray to them for help and pity. Yes, saith the Catechism, we may pray to them, that being moved with pity towards us, they would help us with their favour and intercession with God. But yet this doth not clear the matter; for elsewhere the Roman Catechism attributes more to saints than mere intercession;† and we may pray to them for what is in their power: for where it undertakes to give an exact account of the reason of invocation of saints and angels, it there parallels them with magistrates under a king; and saith, they are God's ministers in governing the Church: *Invocandi itaque sunt quod et perpetuo Deum intuentur, et Patrocinium salutis nostræ libentissime suscipiunt*. What is this *Patrocinium salutis nostræ*? Is it only praying and intercession with God? That cannot be, for it instances presently in deliverances by angels, and Jacob's praying to the angel to bless him, and not merely to intercede for him. But though this is spoken of angels, yet from hence it infers the invocation of saints too. But what need we insist more on this, since they do own the ministry of saints as well as angels, with respect to the Church; and do canonize saints for particular countries, as lately St. Rosa for Peru. And where there is such a particular protection supposed, what incongruity is it to interpret the form of their prayers, according to a doctrine so received and allowed? But of this more under the next head.

2. He confesses that we are all redeemed by the blood of Christ alone, and that he is our only Mediator of redemption;

* Catech. Rom. Part. 4. c. 6. n. 2, 3. [p. 406. Lips. 1847.]

† Catech. Rom. Part. 3. c. 2. n. 4, 6. [ut supra.] Cum præsent nobis Sancti & rerum nostrarum curam gerant. Bellarm. de Sanct. Beatit. l. 1. c. 20. § deinde. Non solum ab Angelis sed etiam a spiritibus beatorum hominum Regi et Gubernari fideles viventes. Id. ib. c. 18. §. nos autem.

but as for mediators of intercession, he doth not doubt but it is acceptable with God we should have many.

I would ask concerning this distinction, the question which Christ asked concerning John's baptism, "Is it from heaven, or of man?" No doubt there may be such a distinction of mediators, if God please to make them. But who hath authority to appoint mediators with him besides himself? Is it not usurping his prerogative, to appoint the great officers of his kingdom for him? Would any prince upon earth allow this, *vis.* when he hath absolutely declared his pleasure, that his own son should present petitions to him, that others shall take upon them to set up masters of requests themselves? Can any thing be plainer in the New Testament, than that God hath appointed the Mediator of redemption, to be our Mediator of intercession? * And that his intercession is founded upon his redemption. As the high-priest's going into the holy of holies to intercede for the people, was upon the blood of the sacrifice of expiation, which he carried in with him. If there were no revelation in this matter, there might be some reason for it. But since the revelation is so clear in it, this distinction looks just like the Socinian's distinction of a God by nature, and a God by office; which was framed on purpose to avoid the plain texts of Scripture which called Christ God. So doth this look as if it were intended to avoid that clear text, which saith, "There is but one mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus." † Which is presently answered with this distinction; although there be not the least ground in that or any other text for it.

"Yes," saith our author, "Moses was such a mediator for the Israelites; Job for his three friends; Stephen for his persecutors; the Romans were desired by St. Paul to be his mediators, and the Corinthians and Ephesians; so almost every sick person desires the congregation to be his mediator, that is, to be remembered in their prayers," p. 4, 5.

But is there no difference between men praying for one another, and desiring others to pray for them here on earth, and an humble invocation of the saints in heaven to be our mediators of intercession with God there? There is a threefold disparity in the case.

1. Here upon earth we converse with one another as fellow-creatures, and there is no danger of our having an opinion

* John xiv. 13, 14, 16, 23, 24. Heb. vii. 25. and ix. 7, 24. 1 John ii. 1.

† 1 Tim. ii. 5.

thereby, that we are able to assist one another any other way than by our prayers. But the case is very different as to the saints in heaven, who by being addressed to there by such solemn invocation, may too easily be conceived to have the power of bestowing such blessings upon those who call upon them.

2. Heaven is looked on by all mankind who direct their devotions thither, as the particular throne of God, where he dwells, and discovers himself after another manner than he doth upon the earth. And we are directed to pray to our Father in heaven; where he is represented as infinitely above all his creatures; and the great concernment of religion is, to keep up the apprehension of this distance between him and them. Now it is hardly possible to keep it up, if in the public offices of religion, in the solemnest postures of devotion, with eyes lifted up to heaven, they do make addresses, both to God and to his creatures.

3. Men are sure, when they pray to others on earth to pray for them, that they do no more than they can justify in point of discretion, when they speak or write to those that can understand what their desire is; but no man on earth can be certain that the saints in heaven can do it: for it is agreed they cannot do it without a revelation, and no man can be assured there is a revelation; and it is not reasonable to expect it; for they pray to saints to pray to God for them; and they cannot tell what they pray for, unless God to whom they are to pray, reveal to them what it is they must pray to him for. Is it not then the better, the safer, the wiser way, to make our prayers to him, who we are sure is able to hear and help us; and hath promised to grant what we ask in his Son's name? But there is no other name, either under heaven, or in heaven, whereby we can be saved, or our prayers accepted, but his alone.

But our author saith, "It is no part of his faith, how the saints in heaven know the prayers and necessities of such who address themselves to them," p. 5.

But how comes it to be any part of his faith, that they know them? "However he doth not doubt but God can never want means of letting the saints know them," p. 6. And is this a sufficient ground for solemn invocation of saints? God doth not want means to let the Emperor of Japan know a request any one here hath to make to him; but is this a reasonable ground for him at this distance to make it to him? God doth not want means to let the Pope know what a mighty service it would be to the Christian world, to make a wise and truly Christian reformation in the Church; but would this be

a ground sufficient for me at this distance, to make a speech to him about it? I knew a man who understood not a word of Latin, but yet would needs go hear a Latin sermon: some asked him afterwards, what he meant by it? and the chief reason he gave was much like this, "God did not want means to let him know what the preacher meant."

But after all, suppose God should make known to the saints what is desired of them; I ask, whether this be sufficient ground for solemn invocation? When Socinus was not able to defend the Invocation of Christ himself, supposing that he could know our hearts only by revelation; he had nothing material to say, but only that there was a command for it, which can never be so much as pretended in this case.

As to what he alleges of "the Elders falling down before the Lamb, having vials full of odours, which are the prayers of the saints." Apoc. v. 8. It must be strained hard to be brought to this purpose, when both ancient and modern interpreters take it for a representation of what was done upon earth, and not in heaven. And if it were in heaven, prophetic visions were never intended for a measure of our duties. "If the angels do pray for mankind," Zech. i. 12, doth it therefore follow we must pray to them? But we say as the angel did to St. John, Rev. xix. 10, in a like case; "See thou do it not: worship God."

III. *Of addressing more Supplications to the Virgin Mary than to Christ.*

Here is no need of farther stating the question; this only relating to the extraordinary service of the blessed Virgin. And therefore we are presently to attend his motions.

"He believes it damnable to think the Virgin Mary more powerful in heaven than Christ, or that she can in any thing command him," p. 6.

But in good earnest, is it not damnable, unless a man thinks the blessed Virgin more powerful than Christ? Suppose one should think her to have an equal share of power with Christ; is this damnable, or not? Is it not setting up a creature equal with God?

But what thinks he then of those who have attributed an universal dominion to her, over angels, men, and devils? What thinks he not only of psalters, but of a creed, litany, and all the hymns of Scripture being applied to her? * All which

* S. Bonavent. Opusc. tom. 1. ad fin. [vol. 6. p. 502, &c. Rom. 1596.]

was done by a canonized saint in their Church; and the books printed out of the Vatican manuscripts, and dedicated to the Pope. And there we find something more than an *Ora pro nobis* in the Litany; for there is *Parce nobis Domina*: Spare us, good Lady: and *ab omni malo, libera nos Domina*: From all evil, good Lady, deliver us.

What thinks he of another canonized saint, who said, these two propositions are both true,† “All things are subject to God’s command, even the Virgin; and all things are subject to the Virgin, even God.” Was this damnable in a canonized saint?

What thinks he of the noted hymn?

O felix Puerpera nostra pians scelera,
Jure Matris impera Redemptori!

Was not this damnable? And I have not only seen it in the old Paris Missal, but Balinghem,‡ a Jesuit, saith, it was in the Missals of Tournay, Liege, Amiens, Artois, and the old Roman. I could produce many other passages cited by him out of the old offices to the same purpose; but I forbear.

But I cannot omit the approbation given to the blasphemous saying of St. Bernardin by Mendoza, who endeavours to prove the blessed Virgin’s kingdom not to be a metaphorical, but a true and real kingdom;§ and by Salazar, another noted Jesuit, who saith, “her kingdom is as large as her Son’s.”|| And we have lately seen how far this divinity is spread, for not many years since, this proposition was sent from Mexico:

Filius non tantum tenetur audire matrem, sed et obedire;¶

“The Son is bound not only to hear, but to obey his mother.” And is it still damnable for to say, she commands him?

But our author saith, “Whatever esteem they have for her, they own her still as a creature.”** Is he sure of that? What thinks he of another saying, which Mendoza approves of, *viz.* of Christ’s saying to his mother, “As thou hast communicated

* S. Bernardin. Sen. apud Bernardin. a Bustis Marial. part. 12. serm. 2.

† Balinghem Parnass. Marian. p. 268. [Duac. 1624.] [Vid. Daille adv. Latin. de Rel. Cultu objecto. Lib. iii. cap. 4. p. 359. Genev. 1664. Natalis Alexander says of this idolatrous and blasphemous language, Non est ab Ecclesia probata et quibusdam tantum missalibus olim inserta. Hist. Eccles. Sec. 5. diss. 25. vol ix. p. 773. Bing. ad Rhem. 1787. J.C.]

‡ Mendoza Virid. Sac. l. 2. Probl. l. and 4. [p. 63, 80. Colon. Agr. 1633.]

§ Salazar pro Immac. Concept. c. 32.

|| Hier. Peres de Nuevos Lapidina Sacra Tr. 1. sect. 12. n. 148.

¶ Page 7.

humanity to me, I will communicate my deity to thee."* But it may be said, we are by no means to judge the sense of a Church by some men's extravagant sayings. I grant it; but I have something considerable to reply; *viz.* That we may easily judge which way the guides of that Church incline by this following passage. About ten years since a gentleman of that communion published a book, called, "Wholesome Advice to the Worshippers of the blessed Virgin;"† and the whole design of it, being printed in Latin and French, was to bring the people of that Church to a bare *Ora pro nobis* to the blessed Virgin. But this was so far from being approved, that the book was condemned at Rome, and vehemently opposed by the Jesuits in France; and a whole volume published against it.

Here I have reason to inquire, whether the Virgin Mary then, according to the sense of the Church of Rome, be only a mediatrix of intercession or not, since so large power and dominion is attributed to her? And why should not her supplicants go beyond an *Ora pro nobis*, if this doctrine be received. As it must be, if the contrary cannot be endured? For that author allowed her intercession, and prayer to her on that account; but he found fault with those who said, she had a kingdom divided with her Son;‡ that she was the mother of mercy, or was a co-Saviour, or co-redemptrix; or that she was to be worshipped with *latria*; or that men were to be slaves to her. Now if these things must not be touched without censure, and no censure pass on the other books; is it not easy to judge, which is more agreeable to the spirit of the guides of that Church?

But we have a fresh instance of this kind at home, in a book very lately published, *Permissu superiorum*. There we are told in the epistle, "that not only the blessed Virgin is the empress of seraphims—the most exact original of practical perfection which the omnipotency of God ever drew; but that by innumerable titles she claims the utmost duty of every Christian, as a proper homage to her greatness."§ What can be said more of the Son of God in our nature? In the book

* Viridar. Sacr. l. 2. Probl. 2. n. 11.[ut supra, p. 69.]

† La veritable Devotion envers la S. vierge Etable et Defendu par et Pere Crasset, à Paris, A. D. 1679.

‡ Monita Salutaria B. V. Mariæ ad Cultores suos indiscretos §. 3. n. 56. §. 4

§ Contemplations on the Life and Glory of holy Mary, the Mother of Jesus, A. D. 1685.

itself she is said to be queen of angels, patroness of the Church, advocate of sinners;* that the power of Mary in the kingdom of Jesus,† is suitable to her maternity, and other privileges of grace; and therefore by it she justly claims a servitude from all pure creatures. But wherein doth this special devotion to her consist? He names several particulars.

1. In having an inward, cordial and passionate value of the maternity of Mary, and all other excellencies proper to, and inseparable from the mother of God.

2. In external acts of worship of eminent servitude towards her, by reason of the amplitude of her power in the empire of Jesus. And can we imagine these should go no farther, than a poor *Ora pro nobis*? He instances in these external acts of her worship. (1.) Frequent visiting holy places dedicated to her honour. And are not those her temples then? which Bellarmine‡ confesses to be a peculiar part of the worship due to God. And the distinction of Basilicæ cannot hold here; because he believes the assumption of the blessed Virgin; and he will not pretend to her honour is only for discrimination. (2.) A special reverence towards images representing her person. (3.) Performing some daily devotions containing her praises, congratulating her excellency, or imploring her mediation; and by oft calling upon the sacred name of holy Mary, &c.

3. In having a firm and unshaken confidence in her patronage amidst the greatest of our inward conflicts, and outward tribulations; through a strong judgment of her eminent power within the empire of Jesus, grounded upon the singular prerogative of her divine maternity. I have not patience to transcribe more, but refer the reader to the book itself; only the eighth particular of special devotion is so remarkable, that it ought not to be passed over, *vis.* "Entering a solemn covenant with holy Mary, to be for ever her servant, client and devotee, under some special rule, society or form of life, and thereby dedicating our persons, concerns, actions, and all the moments and events of our life to Jesus, under the protection of his divine mother, choosing her to be our adoptive mother, patroness and advocate; and intrusting her with what we are, have, do, or hope in life, death, and through all eternity."§ And is all this no more than an *Ora pro nobis*? And it follows, "Put yourself wholly under her protection."|| What a pitiful thing was the

* Page 4

† Page 8.

‡ Bellarm. de Cultu Sanct. l. 3. c. 4. init. [Tom. 2. p. 480. ut supra.]

§ Page 12.

|| Page 14.

old Collyridian cake, in comparison of these special acts of devotion to her ! But there are some extraordinary strains of devotion afterwards, which it is pity to pass over. As, "I will ever observe thee as my sovereign lady, adoptive mother, and most powerful patroness ;* relying on thy bowels of mercy, in all my wants, petitions, and tribulations of body and mind." Could any thing greater be said to the eternal Son of God ? And in the praise :

" *Vers.* Open my lips, O mother of Jesus.

" *Resp.* And my soul shall speak forth thy praise.

" *Vers.* Divine lady, be intent to my aid.

" *Resp.* Graciously make haste to help me.

" *Vers.* Glory be to Jesus and Mary.

" *Resp.* As it was, is, and ever shall be."

Then follows the eighth Psalm, applied thus to her.

" Mary, mother of Jesus,† how wonderful is thy name, even unto the ends of the earth !

" All magnificence be given to Mary, and let her be exalted above the stars and angels.

" Reign on high as queen of seraphims and saints ; and be thou crowned with honour and glory, &c.

" Glory be to Jesus and Mary," &c.

In the next page, follows a cantique in imitation of the *Te Deum*.

" Let us praise thee, O mother of Jesus ! Let us acknowledge thee our sovereign lady.

" Let men and angels give honour to thee, the first conceived of all pure creatures,"‡ &c.

I think I need mention no more ; only three things I shall observe, (1.) That this is now printed *permissu superiorum* ; and we thank them for the seasonableness of it, in helping us in true representing what their allowed doctrines and practices are. (2.) That this is published in English, that our people as well as theirs, may be convinced how far we have been from unjust charging them as to such things as these (3.) That at the same time they plead for keeping the Bible out of the hands of the people, wherein their discretion is so far to be commended, since the Scripture and this new scheme of devotion, can never stand together. There being not one word in the Bible towards it, but very much against it ; and the Psalms and Hymns must be burlesqued to sound that way.

But what saith our author to their Rosaries, wherein there

* Page 22.

† Page 24.

‡ Page 25.

are ten Ave Marias to one Paternoster ; which is accounted a special piece of devotion ; and great things are said of the effects of it by Alanus de Rupe, and many others.

1. As to the Ave Marias, he saith, "there is no more dishonour to God in reciting the angelical salutation, than in the first pronouncing it by the angel Gabriel and Elizabeth."* But it may not be altogether so pertinent. But doth he really think they said the whole Ave Maria, as it is used among them ? Did the angel and Elizabeth say, "*Sancta Maria, mater Dei ?*" or "*ora pro nobis peccatoribus, nunc et in hora mortis nostræ ?*" If not, to what purpose are they mentioned here ?

2. "As to the repetition," that, he saith, "is no more an idle superstition, than David's repeating the same words twenty-six times in the 136th Psalm." But what is this to the question, why more supplications to the blessed Virgin, than to Christ ? And not one word of answer is given to it. But Alanus de Rupe† answers it roundly, "Because the blessed Virgin is our mediatrix to Christ, the mother of mercy, and the special patroness of sinners." This is indeed true representing.

IV. *Of paying divine Worship to Relics.*

For the right understanding this controversy, we are to consider,

1. That there is a due veneration to the bodies of saints and martyrs, allowed on both sides ; and there is an undue worship of them, which is disowned on both sides. The due veneration is, a religious decency to be observed towards them ; which lies in avoiding any thing like contempt or dishonour to them, and using all such testimonies of respect and decency, which becomes the remains of excellent persons ; provided we are satisfied with their sincerity, without having recourse to divine omnipotency to prove them ; which Ferrandus the Jesuit runs so much to, to prove the truth of many relics, worshipped in the Church of Rome in many places at once. But that it is possible to exceed in the worship of true relics, even Bellarmine confesseth, who says, that God took away the body of Moses, lest the people should give divine worship to it. And St. Jerome,‡ as hot as he was against Vigilantius, yet he utterly denied giving any adoration to the relics of martyrs. It seems then it is very possible to exceed that way.

‡ Page 7.

† Alanus de Rupe de usu Psalterii, l. 1 c. 6.

‡ [Vid. Bellarm.] De Imag. Sanct. l. 2. c. 4. [Tom. 2. p. 430. ut supra.]

[‡ Cultores Dei eam adorare non debent. In Dan. iii. vol. 5. p. 638. Veron. 1736.]

2. The question then is, whether those acts of worship which are allowed in the Church of Rome, do not go beyond due veneration? For it is unreasonable to suppose those who give it, do believe those relics to be gods; and therefore it must be such a worship as is given to them, supposing them to be only relics of such persons. The Council of Trent decrees honour and veneration to be given to them, but never determines what is due, and what not: it forbids all excesses in drinking and eating, in the visiting of relics; but not a word of excesses in worshipping of them, unless it be comprehended under the name of superstition. But superstition lies in something forbidden, according to their notion of it: therefore, if there be no prohibition by the Church, there can be no superstition in the worship of them. And if they had thought there had been any in the known practices of the Church, they would certainly have mentioned them; and because they did not, we ought in reason to look on them as allowed. And yet not only Cassander complains of the great superstition about them;* but even the Walenburgii lately confess, that the abuses therein, have not only been offensive to us, but to themselves too.

But what saith our Representer to them?

"He believes it damnable to think there is any divinity in the relics of saints, or to adore them with divine honour," p. 7. But what is this adoring them with divine honour? A true representer ought to have told us what he meant by it, when the whole controversy depends upon it. Is it only saying mass to relics, or believing them to be gods? Is there no giving divine honour by prostration, burning of incense, &c.? Nothing in expecting help from them? Yes, if it be from any hidden power of their own. But here is a very hard question: If a man doth not believe it to be an intrinsic power in the relics, may a man safely go to them, *Opis impetrandæ causa*, as the Council of Trent saith, in hopes of relief from them? Is it not possible for the devil to appear with Samuel's true body, and make use of the relic of a saint to a very bad end? Then, say I, no relics can secure men against the imposture of evil spirits, who, by God's permission, may do strange things with the very relics of saints.

"But God hath visibly worked by them," saith our author, "by making them instruments of many miracles; and it is as easy

* Cassand. Consult. Art. 21. Tract. Special. 4. Controv. 4. [p. 161. Lugd. 1608.]

for him to do it now," p. 8, 9. This is the force of all he saith. To which I answer, (1.) It is a very bold thing to call in God's omnipotency, where God himself hath never declared he will use his power; for it is under his own command, and not ours. But there is no reason to deduce the consequence of using it now, because he hath done it formerly.* And that they may not think this is cavilling in us, I desire them to read Pere Annat's answer to the Jansenists' pretended miracle at Port Royal, *viz.* of the cure wrought by one of our Saviour's thorns. There he gives another account of such miracles than would be taken from us. But where he saith, "It is as much for the honour of God's name to work such miracles now;" their own authors will tell him the contrary; and that there is no such reason now, as in former times, when religion was to be confirmed by them; and when martyrs suffered upon the sole account of the truth of it; and therefore their reputation had a great influence upon converting the unbelieving world. (2.) Suppose it be granted, yet it proves not any religious worship to be given to them. For I shall seriously ask an important question: Whether they do really believe, any greater miracles have ever been done by relics, than were done by the brazen serpent? And yet, although that was set up by God's own appointment, when it began to be worshipped after an undue manner, it was thought fit by Hezekiah to be broken in pieces. What now was the undue worship they gave to it? Did they believe the serpent, which could neither move nor understand, was itself a god? But they did burn incense to it. And did that make a god of it? Suppose men burn incense to relics; what then, are they made gods presently? Suppose they do not, but place them upon altars, carry them in procession, fall down before them, with intention to shew the honour they do them: are not these as much as burning a little incense, which could not signify so much honour as the other do? and it is hard then to make the one unlawful, and not the other.

V. *Of the Eucharist.*

There are two material points under this head, which are to be examined, because he endeavours to set them off with all the advantages he can, *viz.* adoration of the host, and transubstantiation.

* Rabat. Joy de Jansenists, A. D. 1656.

1. *Of the Adoration of the Host.*

1. The question is far enough from being, whether it be lawful to commit idolatry? as our Representer puts it. For the Misrepresenter saith, "That a Papist believes it lawful to commit idolatry:" and to clear this, our author gravely saith, "He believes it unlawful to commit idolatry," p. 9. As though any men ever owned it to be lawful: which is, as if the question were, whether such a man committed adultery, and he should think to clear himself by saying, he believed it unlawful to commit adultery.

2. The question is not, whether Christ may be lawfully adored by us in the celebration of the eucharist; which we are so far from denying, that our Church requires our receiving it in the posture of adoration.

3. The true question is, whether the body of Christ, being supposed to be present in the host by transubstantiation, be a sufficient ground to give the same adoration to the host, which they would do to the person of Christ?

And that this is the true state of the question, will appear by these things.

1. The Council of Trent first defined transubstantiation, and from thence inferred adoration of the host; as is most evident to any one that will read the fourth and fifth decrees of the 13th session. *Nullus itaque dubitandi locus, &c. i. e.* If transubstantiation be true, then adoration follows. It is true, the sixth canon only speaks of Christ being there worshipped; but that ought to be compared with the first, second, and fourth canons, where the doctrine of transubstantiation, is fully set down, as the foundation of that adoration.

2. The adoration is not fixed on the person of Christ, as separated from the host, but as making one object of worship together with it. And so the Council of Trent declares in the sixth decree; when it saith, "The sacrament is never the less to be adored, because it was instituted to be received." This cannot be otherwise understood, than as relating to the sacrament: and so that, whatever it be must be granted to be the object of adoration. "By the sacrament," saith Cardinal Pallavicini, "is understood the object made up of the body of Christ, and the accidents."* The worship then being confessed to be adoration, which is due to God alone, and that adoration directed to the sacrament as its proper object; the question

* Pallavicin. Hist. Concil. Trident. l. 12. c. 6.

now is, whether such a supposition in the sacrament, doth justify that adoration?

Our author saith, "He accounteth it most damnable to worship or adore any breadden god, or to give divine honour to any elements of bread and wine," p. 9.

Then, I say, by his own confession, if it be only bread, he commits idolatry; for the adoration he cannot deny. But our Representer loves ambiguous expressions, which to the people sound very well, but have no sincere meaning: for what is it he understands by his breadden god? If it be that he worships a god which himself supposes to be nothing but bread, we do not charge him with it; but if it be what we believe it to be, the substance of bread, but himself believes to be turned into the body of Christ, then he cannot deny his adoration to be given to it.

All that can excuse them is, the supposition; and whether that will or not, is now to be considered.

1. If it be not true, themselves grant it to be idolatry. The testimonies of Bishop Fisher, and Costerus,* are so well known to the purpose, that I shall not repeat them. And Catharinus, a divine of note in the Council of Trent, confesses it is idolatry to worship an unconsecrated host, although the person, through a mistake, believes it consecrated.† And he quotes St. Thomas and Paludanus for his opinion; and gives this reason for it; because Christ is not worshipped simply in the sacrament, but as he is under the species; and therefore if he be not so present, a creature hath divine worship given it. As those were guilty of idolatry, who worshipped any creatures of old, supposing God to be there, as that he was the soul of the world. They were not excused, saith he, that they thought they worshipped but one God; because they worshipped him as present in such manner, as he was not. And this book of his, he saith, in the review of it, was seen and approved by the Pope's order, by their divines at Paris.‡

2. If the bread were taken to be God, our author doth not deny it would be idolatry, for that were to worship a breadden god. Yet here would be a mistake, and a gross one; yet the mistake would not excuse the persons committing it from damnable idolatry, as he confesses: why then should the

* Roffens. c. Oecolamp. l. 1. c. 2. [p. 760, &c. Wirceb. 1597.] Coster. Enchirid. c. 8. n. 10. [p. 301. Col. Agr. 1589.]

† Catharin. in Cajet. p. 133, &c. Ed. Paris. 1535.

‡ Lugdan. 1542.

other mistake excuse them, when they suppose the substance of the bread not to be there, but the body of Christ to be under the species? Yes, say they, "then no creature is supposed to be the object of worship." But when the bread is supposed to be God, it must be supposed not to be a creature. There is no answer to be given in this case, but that the bread really is a creature, whatsoever they imagined; and if this mistake did not excuse, neither can the other.

2. *Of Transubstantiation.*

Three things our author goes upon, with respect to this.

1. He supposes Christ's words to be clear for it.
2. He shews the possibility of it, from God's omnipotency.*
3. He argues against the testimony or evidence of sense or reason in this case, from some parallel instances, as he thinks.

1. "He believes Jesus Christ made his words good, pronounced at his last supper, really giving his body and blood to his Apostles; the substance of bread and wine being, by his powerful words, changed into his own body and blood; the species only, or accidents of the bread and wine, remaining as before. The same he believes of the eucharist consecrated now by priests."

This is a very easy way of taking it for granted, that the words are clear for transubstantiation. And from no better ground, to fly to God's omnipotency to make it good, is as if one should suppose Christ really to be turned into a rock, a vine, a door; because the words are every jot as clear, and then call in God's omnipotency, which is as effectual to make them good. I confess, these words are so far from being clear to me for transubstantiation, that if I had never heard of it, I should never have thought of it, from these or any other words of Scripture, *i. e.* not barely considering the sound of words, but the Eastern idioms of speaking; the circumstances of our Saviour's real body at that time when he spake them; the uncouth way of feeding on Christ's real body, without any objection made against it by his disciples. The key our Saviour elsewhere gives for understanding the manner of eating his flesh; and withal, if these words be literally and strictly understood, they must make the substance of bread to be Christ's body; for that is unavoidably the literal sense of the words. For can any man take *this* to be any thing but this

* P. 9, 10, 11, 12.

bread, who attends to the common sense and meaning of words, and the strict rules of interpretation? Yet this sense will by no means be allowed; for then all that can be inferred from these words, is, that when Christ spake these words, the bread was his body. But either Christ meant the *bread* by *this*, or he did not; if he did, the former proposition is unavoidable in the literal sense: if he did not, then by virtue of these words, the bread could never be turned into the body of Christ. For that only could be made the body of Christ which was meant, when Christ said, "This is my body." This seems to me to be as plain and convincing as any demonstration in Euclid. Which hath often made me wonder at those who talk so confidently of the plain letter of Scripture being for this doctrine of transubstantiation. But several divines of the Church of Rome understood themselves better, and have confessed that this doctrine could not be drawn out of the literal sense of these words; as it were easy to shew, if it had not been lately done already. It is enough here to observe, that Vasquez* confesseth it of Scotus, Durandus, Paludanus, Ockam, Cameracensis; and himself yields that they do not, and cannot signify expressly the change of the bread and wine into the body of Christ. For how can, *this is my body*, literally signify, *this is changed into my body*? If that proposition were literally true, "*this is my body*," it overthrows the change; for how can a thing be changed into that which it is already?

2. "He believes Christ, being equal to his Father in truth and omnipotency, can make his words good." We do not in the least dispute Christ's omnipotency, but we may their familiar way of making use of it to help them out, when sense and reason fail them. And therefore Cajetan† well said, "We ought not to dispute about God's absolute power in the doctrine of the sacraments, being things of such constant use; and that it is a foolish thing to attribute to the sacrament all that God can do."

But we must consider what he saith against sense and reason. "For the believing this mystery he does not at all think it meet for any Christian to appeal from Christ's words, to his own senses or reason, for the examining the truth of what he hath said, but rather to submit his senses and reason to

* Vasq. in 3 part. Disc. 180. Q. 75. Art. 2. c. 5.

† Cajetan. in 3 part. Q. 75. Art. 1, 2, 3. [Venet. 1612.]

Christ's words in the obsequiousness of faith." What! whether we know this to be the meaning of Christ's words, or not? And thus we shall be bound to submit to every absurd interpretation of Scripture, because we must not use our senses or reason for examining the truth of what is said there. Can any thing be plainer said in Scripture, than that God hath eyes, and ears, and hands? Must now every man yield to this in the obsequiousness of faith, without examining it by principles of common reason? And we think we are therefore bound to put another sense upon those expressions, because they imply a repugnancy to the divine perfections. Why not then where something is implied which is repugnant to the nature of Christ's body, as well as to our senses? But the question about judging in this matter by our senses, is not, as our author is willing to suppose, *vis.* Whether our senses are to be believed against a clear and express divine revelation; but whether the judgment of our senses and reason is not to be made use of for finding out the true sense of this revelation? And we think there is great reason for it.

(1.) Because we have no certain way of judging the substance of a body, than by our senses. We do not say our senses go beyond the accidents; but we say, our senses, by those accidents, do assure us of the bodily substance, or else it were impossible for us to know there is any such thing in the world.

(2.) Because Christ did himself appeal to the judgment of his disciples' senses concerning the truth of his own body after the resurrection: "Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself; handle me and see, for a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have."* Now we think we have reason to allow the same criterion which Christ himself did about the very same body; unless he had then told his disciples, that there was to be another supernatural manner of existence of the same body, concerning which their senses were not to be judges.

(3.) Some of the most important articles of the Christian faith do suppose the judgment of our senses to be true. As about the truth of Christ's body; whether he had really a body, or only the outward accidents and appearance of a body: if he had not, he did not really suffer upon the cross, and so the sacrifice of propitiation there offered up to the Father for

* Luke xxiv. 39.

the sins of mankind is lost. There was a great controversy in St. John's time, and afterwards, whether Christ had any real body? Those who denied it, brought revelation for it; those who asserted it, proved it by their senses, as St. John himself, "that which we have seen, and heard, and our hands have handled,"* &c. He doth not tell men, they must submit their sense and reason to the pretence of revelation; but they ought to adhere to the judgment of their senses concerning the reality of Christ's body. Since therefore Christ himself appealed to it, and the Apostles made use of it, without any caution or limitation, we have great reason to rely still on the judgment of our senses concerning the same object, *viz.* the body of Christ.

3. But we must now consider his instances to overthrow the judgment of our senses and reason in this point.

1. "He believes Christ to be God, though to senses he seemed nothing but man." Do we ever pretend to judge of Christ's divinity by our senses? How then can this be pertinent, when our only dispute is about judging of his body, and the substance of bread and wine by them? And yet the senses were of great use as to the proof of his divinity by the miracles which he wrought; which if they had been like the pretended miracles in transubstantiation, could have convinced no man, because they could never see them.

2. "He believes the Holy Ghost descended on our Saviour, though senses or reason could discover it to be nothing but a dove." If there were no reason to judge otherwise, the judgment of sense were to be followed: but since the Scripture declares it was the Holy Ghost descending as a dove, we have no reason to question that revelation. For we do not pretend that our senses are so far judges of divine appearances, as to exclude the possibility of God's assuming the shape and figure of his creature when he pleases, by moulding the substance of a real body into such a representation. Thus we do not deny the possibility of an appearance of the Holy Ghost under bread and wine, if God thought fit, any more than under a dove; and in this case we do not pretend that our senses can exclude the presence of a Spirit under the elements; but that is very different from the present case, for here the substance is supposed to be gone, and nothing but accidents remaining; and no spiritual presence of Christ is denied, but that of his body, the very same body which suffered on the cross.

* 1 St. John i. 1, 3.

3. "He believes the man who appeared to Joshua (ch. v. 13.), and the three men to Abraham (Gen. xviii.) were really and substantially no men, notwithstanding all the information and evidence of sense to the contrary, from their colour, features, proportion, talking, eating, and many others." And what follows from hence, but that spiritual invisible substances may be under the appearance of bodies, and that our senses cannot be judges of them? Which is not our question, but, whether bodies can be so present after the manner of spirits, as to lose all the natural properties of bodies? and whether a material substance can be lost, under all the accidents proper to it, so as our senses cannot be proper judges of one by the other?

But our author seems to grant this, in a natural way of the existence of a body: but he saith, "Christ gives to his body a supernatural manner of existence, by which being left without extension of parts, and rendered independent of place, it may be one and the same in many places at once, and whole in every part of the symbols, and not obnoxious to any corporeal contingencies."

This is to me a mystery beyond all comprehension by sense or reason; and there is certainly a great difference between governing our understandings, and giving them up, as we must do if this doctrine hold good; for it overthrows any fixed principles of reason in mankind concerning the nature and properties of bodies.

For, 1. We must still suppose the body of Christ to be the very same individual body which suffered upon the cross; but if it have no extension of parts, and be reckoned independent upon place, it ceaseth to be a body. It is granted, that after a natural way of existence, a body cannot be in more places than one; but let the way of existence be what it will, if it be a body, it must be finite; if finite, it must be limited and circumscribed; and if it be circumscribed within one place, it cannot be in more places, for that is to make it circumscribed, and not circumscribed; undivided from itself, and divided from itself at the same time. Which is a manifest contradiction, which doth not depend only on quantity or extension, but upon the essential unity of a body.

2. If it be possible for a body to be in several places by a supernatural existence; why may not the same body be in several places by a natural existence? Is it not because extension and circumscription are so necessary to it, that in a

natural way it can be but in one place? Then it follows that these are essential properties of bodies; so that no true body can be conceived without them.

3. This supernatural existence doth not hinder the body's being individually present in one place. My meaning is this: a priest consecrates an host at London, and another at York; is the body of Christ at London so present there, by virtue of consecration, as to be present at York too, by this supernatural existence? What then doth the consecration at York produce? If it be not, then its presence is limited to the host where the consecration is made; and if it be so limited, then this supernatural existence cannot take off its relation to place.

4. The same body would be liable to the greatest contradictions imaginable; for the same body, after this supernatural way of existence, may not only be above and below, within and without, near and far off from itself, but it may be hot and cold, dead and alive, yea, in heaven and hell at once.

5. What is it that makes it still a body after this supernatural way of existence, &c. if it lose extension and dependence on place? If it be only an aptitude to extension, when that supernatural existence is taken off, then it must either be without quantity, or with it: if it be without quantity, how can it be a body? if with quantity, how is it possible to be without extension?

6. This confounds all the differences of greater and less, as well as of distance and nearness. For, upon this supposition, a thing really greater may be contained within a less; for the whole original body of Christ, with all its parts, may be brought within the compass of a wafer, and the whole be in every part without any distance between head and foot.

7. This makes Christ to have but one body, and yet to have as many bodies as there are consecrated hosts. No; saith our author, "this supernatural manner of existence is without danger of multiplying his body, or making as many Christs as altars," p. 11. But how this can be, is past all human understanding; for every consecration hath its effect, which is supposed to be the conversion of the substance of the bread into the body of Christ. Now, when a priest at London converts the bread into the body of Christ there, he doth it not into the body of Christ at York, but the priest there doth it; therefore the body of Christ at London is different from that at York, or else the conversion at London would be into the body as at York; but if not, what is the substantial term of this substan-

tial change, where nothing but an accidental mode doth follow? If there be any such term, whether that must not be a production of something which was not before; and if it be so, Christ must have as many new bodies as there are consecrations.

8. This makes that which hath no particular subsistence of its own, to be the subject of a substantial change; for this is the condition of Christ's body, whatever its manner of existence be, after the hypostatical union to the divine nature. For, when Bellarmine,* Petavius, and others of their greatest divines, undertake, against Nestorius, to explain the hypostatical union, they tell us it consists in this, that the human nature loseth its proper subsistence, and is assumed into the subsistence of the divine nature. From whence I infer, that the body of Christ, having no proper subsistence of its own, there can be no substantial change into that which hath no proper subsistence, but into that which hath, and consequently the change must be into the divine nature principally; from whence it will follow, the elements losing their subsistence upon consecration, the divinity must be united hypostatically to them as to the human nature, and so there will be as many hypostatical unions as there are consecrations. And so this doctrine not only confounds sense and reason, but the mysteries of Christ's incarnation too: which I think is sufficient for this head.

VI.—*Of Merits and Good Works.*

For the true stating this controversy, we are to observe:

1. That we do not charge those of the Church of Rome, "that they believe Christ's death and passion to be ineffectual and insignificant, and that they have no dependence on the merits of his sufferings, or the mercy of God, for attaining salvation, but that they are to be saved only by their own merits and good works;" as the Misrepresenter saith, p. 12.

2. We do not charge them with denying the "necessity of divine grace in order to merit, or with asserting that they can merit independently thereupon."

3. We do by no means dispute about the necessity of good works, in order to the reward of another life, or assert that Christ's merits will save men without working out their own

* Bellarm. de Incarn. l. 3. c. 8. Petav. de Incarnatione, p. 6. c. 1. §. 3.

salvation; but do firmly believe, that God will judge men according to their works.

The question then is, "whether the good works of a just man," as our author expresses it, "are truly meritorious of eternal life?" which he affirms, but qualifies with saying, "that they proceed from grace, and that, through God's goodness and promise, they are truly meritorious."* But the Council of Trent "denounces an anathema against those who deny the good works of justified persons to be truly meritorious of the increase of grace, and of eternal life."†

Here, then, lies the point in difference: 1. Whether such good works can be said to be truly meritorious? 2. Whether those who deny it deserve an anathema for so doing? As to what relates to God's acceptance and allowance, and his goodness and promise, we freely own all that he saith about it; and if no more be meant, what need an anathema about this matter? There must therefore be something beyond this, when good works are not only said to be truly meritorious, but we are cursed if we do not say the same.

To make any thing truly meritorious, we must suppose these conditions requisite:

1. That what we pretend to merit by, be our own free act.
2. That it be not defective.
3. That there be an equality between it and the reward due to it.
4. That there be an obligation, in point of justice, to give that reward to him that doth it.

And from these considerations, we deny that good works, even of justified persons, can be truly meritorious.

1. It is granted by themselves, that what is truly meritorious, must be a free act of the person who doth it. Now, the good works of justified persons cannot be said to be their own free acts, if the power of doing them depend upon divine assistance, and there was an antecedent obligation upon them to perform them; so that they can do nothing but what they are bound to, as God's creatures; and their very power of doing it is from the grace of God.‡ If men pretended to merit at another's hands by what God gives, there were some colour for it; but to merit from God himself by what he gives us seems

* Pag. 13.

† Concil. Trident. sess. 6. can. 32. [Labbe, ut supra, vol. 14. p. 768.]

‡ Meritum est actio libera cui merces debetur ex justitia. Coster. Enchirid. de Meritis bon. Oper. c. 7. [p. 273. Col. Agr. 1589.]

very incongruous. If I owe a man a hundred pounds, and another, knowing me unable to pay it, gives me so much to pay the debt, this is no more than what may be called strict payment, as to the creditor; but if the creditor himself gives me this hundred pounds to pay himself with, will any man call this strict payment? * He may call it so himself if he pleases, but that only shews his kindness and favour; but it doth not look very modestly or gratefully for the debtor to insist upon it as true legal payment. Just so it is in good works done by the power of God's grace, which we could never have done without it; and therefore such cannot be truly meritorious.

2. What is truly meritorious must not be defective, because the proportion is to be equal between the act and the reward due to it; which being perfect, requires that there be no defect in the acts which merit it. But this can never be said of good works of justified persons, that have no defects in them. We do not say they are not good works, but they are not exact and perfect; for, although the grace of God, as it comes from him, be a perfect gift, yet, as it acts upon men's minds, it doth not raise them to such a degree, but that they have imperfections in their best actions: and whatever is defective, is faulty; whatever is faulty, must be forgiven; whatever needs forgiveness, cannot be truly meritorious. But not only their good works are defective, but if they would merit, they ought to have none but good works; whereas the mixture of others renders the good incapable of being meritorious, because there is so much to be pardoned, as takes away all claim of merit in the good they perform. And themselves do not pretend that men can merit the grace of remission; but it is very strange, that those who cannot deserve to be forgiven, should deserve to have an infinite reward bestowed upon them.

3. There must be an exact proportion between the act and the recompense: for to merit, is to pay a price for a thing; † and in such acts of commutative justice, there must be an equality of one thing with another. But what equality can there be between the imperfect good works of the best men, and the most perfect happiness of another world, ‡ especially

* In quantum homo propria voluntate facit id quod debet, meretur apud Deum, alioquin reddere debitum non esset meritorium. Aquin. 1. 2. qu. 114. artic. 1. resp. ad 1. [vol. 21. p. 528. col. 2. Venet. 1787.]

† Meritum se habet ad præmium sicut pretium ad illud quod emitur. Altisiodor. 1. 3. tr. 12.

‡ Absoluta æqualitas inter mercedem et meritum ponitur per modum justitiæ commutativæ. Bell. Justif. l. 5. c. 14.

when that consists in the fruition of the beatifical vision? For what proportion can there be between our acts towards God, and God's acts towards the blessed in heaven? Let the acts be of what person soever, or of what nature soever, or from what principle soever; as long as they are the acts of finite imperfect creatures, it is impossible there should be any equality, or exact proportion between them and the eternal favour of God, which is the reward promised.

4. Where acts are truly meritorious, there follows an obligation of strict justice to pay the recompence due to them. But what strict justice can there be between the Creator and his creatures, to recompense the service they are bound to perform, when their very being, power to act, assistance in acting, and recompence for it, are all from his bounty and goodness? But our author would avoid all this, by saying, that though good works are truly meritorious, yet it is "through the merits of Christ, and as they proceed from grace, and through his goodness and promise, that they are so;" *i. e.* they are truly meritorious, because it appears, from all these things, they neither are nor can be meritorious. For,

(1.) How come the merits of Christ to make good works truly meritorious? Are the merits of Christ imputed to those good works? Then those good works must be as meritorious as Christ's own works; which I suppose he will not assert. Or, is it that Christ hath merited the grace whereby we may merit? But even this will not make our personal acts truly meritorious; and the nature of merit relates to the acts, any not to the power.

(2.) How comes the power of grace to make them truly meritorious; when the power of grace doth so much increase the obligation on our side? If it be said, that the state of grace puts men into a capacity to merit; we might more reasonably infer the contrary, that it puts them out of a capacity of meriting; because the remission of sins, and the favour of God, are things for which we can never make any recompense.

(3.) How comes a divine promise to make acts truly meritorious? For God's promise is an act of mere kindness, which is very different from strict justice: and although by the promise God binds himself to performance; yet how come those acts to be more meritorious of heaven, than the acts of repentance are of remission of sins? Yet none will now say, that there can be any acts meritorious of that. Yet certainly

there is as clear a promise of pardon upon repentance, as there is of heaven upon good works: and if the promise in the other case doth not make repentance meritorious of pardon, how can it make good works truly meritorious of eternal life? But notwithstanding, we do not deny God's fidelity to his promise may be called justice; and so God, as a righteous Judge, may give a crown of righteousness to all that follow St. Paul's example, without making good works to be truly meritorious.*

VII.—*Of Confession.*

1. We do not charge the Church of Rome, "that in the power of absolving, they make gods of men," p. 14; as our Misrepresenter pretends.

2. We do not deny, "that Christ gave to the bishops and priests of the catholic Church, authority to absolve any truly penitent sinner from his sins (which he therefore needlessly proves out of Scripture), and that such absolution is ratified in heaven."

3. We are glad to find that our author declares, "that no man receives benefit by absolution, without repentance from the bottom of his heart, and real intentions of forsaking his sins," p. 15; by which we hope he means more than attrition.

But yet there are some things which stick with us, as to the doctrine and practice of the Church of Rome in this matter, which he takes no notice of.

1. That secret confession of sins to a priest is made so necessary to salvation, that an anathema is denounced against all that deny it, when they cannot deny that God doth forgive sins upon true contrition.† For the Council of Trent doth say, "that contrition, with charity, doth reconcile a man to God before the sacrament of penance be actually received."‡ But then it adds, "that the desire of confession is included in contrition;" which is impossible to be proved by Scripture, reason, or antiquity. For so lately, as in the time of the Master of the Sentences. and Gratian (in the 12th century), it was a very disputable point, whether confession to a priest were

* 2 Tim. iv. 8.

† Sess. 14. Can. 6. [ut supra, p. 824.]

‡ Sess. 14. c. 4. [Ibid. p. 817.] Lomb. l. 4. Dist. 17. [fol. 364. p. 2. Colon. Agr. 1566.] Grat. de. Pœnit. Dist. 1. c. 90. [Corp. Jur. Can. vol. 1. p. 1718. Lugd. 1671.] Quidam.

necessary. And it is very hard for us to understand how that should become necessary to salvation since, which was not then. Some of their own writers confess, that some good Catholics did not believe the necessity of it.* I suppose the old canonists may pass for good Catholics; and yet Maldonat saith, "that all the interpreters of the decrees held, that there was no divine precept for confession to a priest;" and of the same opinion he grants Scotus to have been. But he thinks "it is now declared to be heresy," or he wishes it were. And we think it is too much already, unless there were better ground for it.

2. That an anathema is denounced against those who do not understand the words of Christ, "Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted,"† &c. of the sacrament of penance, so as to imply the necessity of confession: whereas there is no appearance in the words of any such sense; and themselves grant, that in order to the remission of sins by baptism (of which St. Matthew and St. Mark speak in the Apostles' commission) there is no necessity of sacramental confession, but a general confession is sufficient.‡ And from hence the elder Jansenius concludes, "that the power of remission of sins here granted doth not imply sacramental confession."§ Cajetan yields, "there is no command for confession here."|| And Catharinus adds, "that Cajetan would not allow any one place of Scripture to prove auricular confession."¶ And as to this particular, he denies that there is any command for it; and he goes not about to prove it, but that Cajetan contradicts himself elsewhere, *viz.* when he wrote school-divinity, before he set himself to the study of the Scriptures. Vasquez saith, "that if these words may be understood of baptism, none can infer from them the necessity of auricular confession."** But Gregory de Valentia evidently proves, that this place doth relate to remission of sins in baptism;†† not only from the

* Greg. de Valentia de Necessit. Confess. c. 2. [De Reb. Fid. Contr. p. 844. Lut. Par. 1610.] Maldonat. Oper. to. 2. de Pœnit. c. 2 et 3.

† John xx. 23.

‡ Matth. xxviii. 19. Mark xvi. 16.

§ Jansen. Concord. Evang. c. 147. [p. 632. Lovan. 1572.]

|| Cajetan. in loc. Ed. Paris. 1540.

¶ Catharin. in Cajetan. l. 5. p. 444. [Par. 1535.]

** Vasquez in 3. Part. Th. tom. 4. Qu. 90. Art. 1. Dub. 2. Num. 2.

†† Greg. de Valent. in Thom. tom. 4. Disp. 7. Qu. 9. Punct. 2. p. 284.

comparison of places, but from the testimonies of St. Cyprian, St. Ambrose, and others.

3. That it is expressed in the same anathemas, that this hath been always the doctrine and practice of the Catholic Church from the beginning. We do not deny the ancient practice, either of canonical confession, as part of the discipline of the Church for public offices; nor of confession, for ease and satisfaction of the perplexed minds of doubting or dejected penitents; but that which we say was not owned nor practised by the Church from the beginning, was this sacramental confession as necessary to the remission of sins before God. It is therefore to no purpose to produce out of Bellarmine, and others, a great number of citations to prove that which we never deny; but if they hold to the Council of Trent, they must prove from the Fathers, that sins after baptism cannot be forgiven without confession to men; which those who consider what they do, will never undertake, there being so many testimonies of undoubted antiquity against it. And it is observable, that Bonaventure grants, that before the Lateran Decree of Innocentius III, it was no heresy to deny the necessity of confession:* and so he excuses those who in the time of Lombard and Gratian, held that opinion. All other Christians in the world, besides those of the Church of Rome, do to this day reject the necessity of particular confession to a priest, in order to remission, as the writers of the Church of Rome themselves confess. So Godignus† doth of the Abyssinians;‡ Philippus a SS. Trinitate, of the Jacobites; Clemens Galanus§ of the Nestorians, who saith, “they made a decree against the use of confession to any but to God alone.” And Alexius Menesis of the Christians of St. Thomas in the Indies. The Greeks believe confession only to be of positive and ecclesiastical institution, as the late author of the Critical History of the Faith and Customs of the Eastern Nations, proves.|| And the very form of their absolution declares, that they do not think par-

* Bonavent. in l. 4. Sent. Dist. 17. part. 2.

† Godign. de Rebus Abyssin. l. 1. c. 8. [c. 28.] [p. 171. Lugd. 1615.]

‡ Itinerarium Orientale, l. 5. c. 8.

§ Galan. Concil. Eccles. Armenæ, to. 2. [to. 3.] p. 605. [Rom. 1661.]

|| Histoire Critique de la Creances et de Coutums des Nations du Levant, ch. 8, p. 105. ch. 1. p. 14. Resp. 1. Jerm. Patriarch. ad Theolog. Wirtemberg. p. 87. Arcud. de Concord. Ecclesiæ Occident. et Orient. in 7. Sacram. l. 4. c. 3. Goar in Eucholog. p. 681. [Lut. Par. 1647.]

ticular confession of all known sins, necessary to pardon; for therein the priest absolves the penitent from the sins he hath not confessed through forgetfulness or shame. And now let any one prove this to have been a catholic tradition by Vincentius' rules, *viz.* "that it hath been always received every where, and by all."

VIII. *Of Indulgences.*

1. They must be extremely ignorant who take the power of indulgences to be a "leave from the Pope to commit what sins they please; and that by virtue thereof, they shall escape punishment for their sins, without repentance in another world." Yet this is the sense of the misrepresentation which, he saith, is made of it. And if he saith true in his Preface, "that he hath described the belief of a Papist, exactly according to the apprehension he had when he was a Protestant,"* he shews how well he understood the matters in difference, when I think no other person besides himself ever had such an apprehension of it, who pretended to be any thing like a scholar.

2. "But now he believes it damnable to hold that the Pope, or any other power in heaven or earth, can give him leave to commit any sins whatsoever; or that for any sum of money, he can obtain any indulgence or pardon for sins that are to be committed by him, or his heirs hereafter." Very well! But what thinks he of obtaining an indulgence, or pardon, after they are committed? Is no such thing to be obtained in the Court of Rome, for a sum of money? He cannot but have heard of the tax of the apostolic chamber for certain sins, and what sums are there set upon them. Why did he not as freely speak against this? This is published in the vast collection of Tracts of Canon Law, set forth by the Pope's authority, where there are certain rates for perjury, murder, apostasy, &c. Now what do these sums of money mean?† If they be small, it is so much the better bargain, for the sins are very great. And Espenæus‡ complains, that this book was so far from being called in, that he saith, the Pope's legate renewed those faculties, and confirmed them. It seems then, a sum of money may be of some consequence towards obtaining pardon for a sin past, though not for a license to commit it. But what mighty

* Pag. 15, 16.

† Tractat. Tractatum. to. 15. Part 1. f. 368.

‡ Espens. in Ep. ad Tit. c. 1. digress. 2.

difference is there whether a man procures with money a dispensation, or a pardon? For the sin can hurt him no more, than if he had license to commit it.

3. "He doth believe there is a power in the Church to grant indulgences; which (he saith) concern not at all the remission of sins, either mortal or venial, but only of some temporal punishments remaining due after the guilt is remitted." Here now arises a material question, *viz.* whether the Popes, or the Representer, be rather to be believed. If the Popes, who grant the indulgences, are to be believed, then not only the bare remission of sins is concerned in them, but the plenary, and most plenary remission of sins is to be had by them. So Boniface VIII. in his bull of Jubilee,* granted, *Non solum plenam et largiorem, imo plenissimam veniam peccatorum.* If these words had no relation to remission of sins, the people were horribly cheated by the sound of them. In the bull of Clement VI. not extant in the Bullarium, but published out of the Utrecht manuscript, not only a plenary absolution from all sins is declared to all persons who died in the way to Rome; but he commands the angels of Paradise to carry the soul immediately to heaven.† And I suppose, whatever implies such an absolution as carries a soul to heaven, doth concern remission of sins. Boniface IX. granted indulgences, *a Poenâ et a Culpa*;‡ and those certainly concerned remission of sins, being not barely from the temporal punishment, but from the guilt itself. Clement VIII. whom Bellarmine§ magnifies for his care in reforming indulgences, in his bull of Jubilee, grants a most plenary remission of sins; and Urban VIII. since him, not only a relaxation of penances, but remission of sins; and so lately as A.D. 1671, Clement X. published an indulgence upon the canonization of five new saints, wherein he not only grants a plenary indulgence of sins, but upon invocation of one of these saints in the point of death, a plenary indulgence of all his sins. And what doth this signify in the point of death, if it do not concern the remission of sins?

4. "Indulgences (he saith) are nothing else but a mitiga-

* Bullar. Cherubin. in to. 1. p. 20. 4.

† Prorsus mandamus Angelis Paradisi, quantum Animam illius à Purgatorio penitus absolutam in Paradisi gloriam introducant. Bulla Clem. 6. Ultrajecti, A.D. 1653.

‡ Gobel. Person. Cosmogr. æt. 6. c. 86. p. 278. [Francof. 1599.]

§ Bellar. to. 3. p. 74. to. 4. p. 86.

tion or relaxation, upon just causes, of canonical penances, which are or may be enjoined by the pastors of the Church on penitent sinners, according to their several degrees of demerits." If by canonical penances, they mean those enjoined by the penitential canons, Greg. de Valentia saith, "this opinion differs not from that of the heretics, and makes indulgences to be useless and dangerous things."* Bellarmine brings several arguments against this doctrine. "(1.) There would be no need of the treasure of the Church; which he had proved to be the foundation of indulgences.† (2.) They would be rather hurtful than profitable, and the Church would deceive her children by them.‡ (3.) They could not be granted for the dead. (4.) They who receive indulgences, do undergo canonical penances. (5.) The form of them doth express, that they do relate to God, and not only to the Church." And this, I think, is sufficient to shew how far he is from truly representing the nature of indulgences; for we do not dispute the Church's power in relaxing canonical penances to penitent sinners upon just causes.

IX. *Of Satisfaction.*

1. "He believes it damnable to think any thing injuriously of Christ's passion:" but then he distinguishes "the eternal and temporal pain due to sin. As to the guilt and eternal pain, the satisfaction, he saith, is proper to Christ; but as to the temporal pain, which may remain due by God's justice, after the other is remitted, he saith, that penitent sinners may in some measure satisfy for that by prayer, fasting, alms," &c. p. 17.

2. "These penitential works, he saith, are no otherwise satisfactory, than as joined and applied to Christ's satisfaction, in virtue of which alone our good works find a grateful acceptance in God's sight." p. 19.

But for right apprehending the state of the controversy, we must consider:

1. That they grant both eternal and temporal pain due to sin, to be remitted in baptism; so that all the satisfaction to be made, is for sins committed after baptism.

2. We distinguish between satisfaction to the Church be-

* Greg. de Valent. de Indulg. c. 2. [De Reb. Fid. ut supra, p. 254.]

† Bell. de Indulg. l. 1. c. 7.

‡ C. 2.

fore absolution, and satisfaction to the justice of God for some part of the punishment due to sin, which is unre-mitted.

3. We do not deny that truly penitential works are pleasing to God, so as to avert his displeasure: but we deny that there can be any compensation in way of equivalency, between what we suffer, and what we deserve.*

The matter in controversy therefore on this head, consists in these things.

1. That after the total remission of sins in baptism, they suppose a temporal punishment to remain, when the eternal is forgiven; which the penitent is to satisfy God's justice for; and without this being done in this life, he must go into purgatory for that end. Of which more under that head.

2. That this satisfaction may be made to the justice of God, after absolution is given by the priest. So that although the penitent be admitted into God's favour by the power of the keys, according to their own doctrine, yet the application of the merits of Christ, together with the saints, in the sentence of absolution (according to their form) doth not set him so free, but he either wants a new supply from the treasure of the Church, *i. e.* from the same merits of Christ and the saints, or else he is to satisfy for the temporal punishment by his own penances.

3. That these penitential works are to be joined with the merits of Christ, in the way of proper satisfaction to divine justice. And however softly this may be expressed; the meaning is, that Christ hath merited that we may merit, and by his satisfaction we are enabled to satisfy for ourselves. And if the satisfaction by way of justice be taken away, the other will be a controversy about words.

4. That these penitential works may not only be sufficient for themselves, but they may be so over-done, that a great share may be taken from them to make up the treasure of the Church for the benefit of others who fall short, when they are duly applied to them in the way of indulgences.† And about these points, we must desire greater proof than we have yet ever seen.

* Catech. Rom. Part. 2. c. 5. n. 52. 56.

† Catech. Rom de Pœnit. Sacr. n. 61.

X. *Of Reading the holy Scripture.*

1. "He believes it damnable in any one, to think, speak, or do any thing irreverently towards the Scripture, or by any means whatsoever to bring it into disrepute or disgrace;" but not being contented with this, he adds, "that he holds it in the highest veneration of all men living."* Now, here we must desire a little better representation of this matter. For certainly, those who derive its authority from the Church; who set traditions in equal esteem with it; who complain so much of its obscurity, can never be said to hold it in equal veneration with those who maintain its independent authority, its sufficiency, and perspicuity. And these are known and material points in controversy between us and them; therefore, let them not say, they hold it in the highest veneration of all men living: though those thought themselves thorough Catholics, who have compared it to a nose of wax, to a Lesbian rule, to a dead letter, unsensed characters, and to other things, not fit to be repeated. But we are well pleased to find them express such veneration for it. Wherefore then are the people to be kept from reading it?

2. He saith, "It is not out of disrespect for it." But why then? (1.) "Because private interpretation is not proper for the Scripture," 2 Pet. i. 20. One would think the Scripture were not kept only from the people, by such a sense being put upon it: for any one that would but consider that place, will find it must relate to the prophets themselves; and doth he think the prophets were to be debarred from reading the Scriptures? But this is playing with the Scripture, and not reasoning from it. (2.) "Because in the Epistles of St. Paul are certain things hard to be understood, which the unlearned and unstable deprave, as also the rest of the Scriptures, to their own perdition," 2 Pet. iii. 16. Now, in my opinion, such men deserve more to be debarred from meddling with the Scripture, who make such perverse inferences from it, than ordinary readers. And if they use all other places as they do this, they cannot be excused from depraving it. It is granted, there were then unlearned and unstable men, who misunderstood, or misapplied the writings of St. Paul, and other Scriptures. And what then? There are men of all ages, who abuse the best things in the world, even the Gospel itself, and

* Pag. 19.

the grace of God. Doth it hence follow, that the Gospel must not be preached to them, or the grace of God made known to them, for fear of men's making ill use of it? If this had been the just consequence, would not St. Peter himself have thought of this? But he was so far from making it, that he adviseth those persons he writes to, to have a mighty regard to the Scriptures, even to the prophetical writings, "as to a light shining in a dark place," 1 Pet. i. 19. According to this way of deducing consequences, St. Peter should have argued just contrary; "the prophetical writings are dark and obscure, therefore meddle not with them, but trust your guides:" whereas the Apostle, after he had told them what the Apostles saw and heard, he adds, "that they have a more sure prophetical word," as the Rhemists translate it. How could that be more sure to them, unless they were allowed to read, consider, and make use of it? (3.) "Because God hath given only some to be apostles, some prophets, other some evangelists, and other some pastors and doctors," Ephes. iv. 11. Doth it hence follow that the people are not to read the Scriptures? In the universities, tutors are appointed to interpret Aristotle to their pupils; doth it hence follow that they are not to read Aristotle themselves? It is, no doubt, a mighty advantage to have such infallible interpreters as the apostles and prophets: and all Christians are bound to follow their sense, where they have delivered it. But suppose the question be about the sense of these interpreters; must their books not be looked into, because of the danger of error? This reason will still hold against those who go about to deliver their sense; and so on, till by this method of reasoning, all sorts of books and interpretations be rejected; unless any such can be found out, which is not liable to be abused or misunderstood. And if there be any such to be had, they are much to blame who do not discover it. But as yet we see no remedy for two things in mankind, a proneness to sin and to mistake. But of all things, we ought not to take away from them one of the best means to prevent both, *viz.* a diligent, and careful, and humble reading the holy Scriptures.

But, 3. He denies "that all persons are forbid to read the Scriptures, but only such as have no license, and good testimony from their curates: and therefore their design is not to preserve ignorance in the people, but to prevent a blind, ignorant presumption."*

* P. 21.

These are plausible pretences to such as search no farther; but the mystery of this matter lies much deeper. It was no doubt the design of the Church of Rome to keep the Bible wholly out of the hands of the people. But upon the Reformation they found it impossible; so many translations being made into vulgar languages; and therefore care was taken to have translations made by some of their own body; and since the people of better inclinations to piety were not to be satisfied without the Bible; therefore they thought it the better way to permit certain persons they could trust, to have a license to read it. And this was the true reason of the fourth rule of the Index Libr. Prohibit. made in pursuance of the order of the Council of Trent, and published by Pius IV. by which any one may see it was not an original permission out of any good will to the thing, by an after-game to get the Bible out of the hands of the people again. And therefore absolution was to be denied to those who would not deliver them to their ordinaries when they were called for: and the regulars themselves were not to be permitted to have Bibles without a license: and as far as I can understand the addition of Clement VIII. to that fourth rule, he withdraws any new power of granting such licenses; and saith they are contrary to the command and usage of that Church, which he saith is to be inviolably observed.* Wherein I think he declares himself fully against such licenses: and how inferior guides can grant them against the command of the head of the Church, is a thing not very agreeable to the unity and subordination they boast of.

XI. *Of Apocryphal Books.*

1. We do not charge the Church of Rome with "making what additions to Scripture they think good," as the Misrepresenter saith;† but we charge them with taking into the canon of Scripture such books as were not received for canonical by the Christian Church; as those books himself mentions, viz. Tobit, Judith, Ecclesiasticus, Wisdom, and Maccabees.

2. We do not only charge them with this, but with anathematizing all those who do not upon this declaration believe them to be canonical; since they cannot but know, that these books never were in the Jewish canon, and were left out by many Christian writers.‡ And if the Church cannot add to the

* Quod quidem inviolate servandum est. Clem. VIII. ad Reg. 4. Indicis Roman.
† P. 21.

‡ Concil. Trident. Sess. 4. 8. Apr. de Canon. Script. [ut supra, p. 746.]

Scripture, and our author thinks it damnable to do it; how can it make any books conical, which were not so received by the Church? For the Scripture in this sense is the canon; and therefore if it add to the canon, it adds to the Scripture; *i. e.* it makes it necessary to believe some books to be of infallible authority, which were not believed to be so, either by the Jewish or Christian Church, as appears by abundant testimonies to that purpose produced by a learned bishop of this Church;* which ought to have been considered by the Representer, that he might not have talked so crudely about this matter.

But, however, I must consider what he saith.

1. He produces the testimony of Greg. Nazianzen,† who is expressly against him, and declares but twenty-two books in the canon of the Old Testament; but how doth he prove that he thought these books canonical? He quotes his Oration on the Maccabees;‡ where I can find nothing like it; and instead of it he expressly follows, as he declares, the book of Josephus, of the authority of reason concerning them. So that if this proves any thing, it proves Josephus's book canonical, and not the Maccabees.

2. He adds the testimony of St. Ambrose,§ who in the place he refers to, enlarges on the story of the Maccabees, but saith nothing of the authority of the book. And even Coccius|| himself grants, that of old Melito Sardensis, Amphilochius, Greg. Nazianzen, the Council of Laodicea, St. Jerome, Ruffinus, and Gregory the Great, did not own the book of Maccabees for canonical.

3. Innocentius *ad Exuperium* speaks more to his purpose; and if that decretal epistle be allowed, against which Bishop Cosins hath made considerable objections,¶ then it must be granted that these books were then in the Roman canon; but that they were not received by the universal Church, appears evidently by the canon of the Council of Laodicea, c. 60, wherein these books are left out; and this was received in the code of the universal Church; which was as clear a proof or the canon then generally received, as can be expected.** It is

* Bp. Cosins' Scholastical History of the Canon of Scripture.

† Greg. Nazianzen. in Carmin. 2 vol. p. 98. [Par. 1630.]

‡ Orat. de Maccab. [Ibid.] vol. 1. p. 398.

§ Ambros. de Jacob. et Vitæ Beat. l. 2. c. 10, 11, 12. [vol. 1. p. 474, &c. Par. 1686.]

|| Cocci. Thes. Catho. l. 6. Act. 18. ¶ Scholastical History, n. 83.

** Euseb. l. 5. c. 24. [p. 191. Par. 1659.]

true the Council of Carthage took them in ; and St. Augustine seems to be of the same opinion. But on the other side they are left out by Melito, bishop of Sardis, who lived near the Apostles' times ; Origen,* Athanasius,† St. Hilary,‡ St. Cyril of Jerusalem,§ Epiphanius,|| St. Basil,¶ Amphilochius,** St. Chrysostom,†† and especially St. Jerome, who hath laboured in this point so much, that no fewer than thirteen places are produced out of him to this purpose, by the fore-mentioned learned bishop of our Church, who clearly proves there was no tradition for the canon of the Council of Trent, in any one age of the Christian Church.‡‡ But our author goes on.

4. It is of little concern to him, whether these books were ever in the Hebrew copy.§§ I would only ask, whether it be of any concern to him whether they are divinely inspired or not ? He saith it is damnable to add to the Scripture : by the Scripture we mean books written by divine inspiration. Can the Church make books to be so written, which were not so written ? If not, then all it hath to do, is to deliver by tradition what was so, and what not. Whence should they have this tradition, but from the Jews ? and they owned no divine inspiration after the time of Malachi. How then should there be any books so written after that time ? And he that saith in this matter, as he doth, it is of little concern to him whether they were in the Hebrew canon, doth little concern himself what he ought to believe, and what not in this matter.

5. Since the Church's declaration, he saith, no Catholics ever doubted.¶¶ What doth he mean by the Church's declaration ? that of Innocentius, and the Council of Carthage ? Then the same bishop hath shewed him, that since that time, there have been very many, both in the Greek and Latin Church, of another opinion. And but a little before the Council of Trent, Catharinus saith,¶¶ that a friend of his, and a brother in Christ, derided him as one that wanted learning, for daring to assert these books were within the canon of Scripture ; and it is

* Orig. præf. in Psalm. [vol. 2. p. 529. Par. 1733.]

† Athan. in Synopsi. [vol. 2. p. 95, &c. Palav. 1777.]

‡ Hilar. præf. in Scal. § St. Cyril. Catech. 4. [p. 69. Venet. 1763.]

|| Epiph. Hær. 8. 76. [p. 19. Colon. 1682.]

¶ Basil. Philocal. c. 3.

** Amphil. Epist. Canon. ad Seleuc. [Ex Iambis ad Seleucum. Beveridge's Pandect, ii. 179.]

†† Chrys. Hom. 4. in Gen.

‡‡ Scholastical History, n. 71.

§§ P. 22.

¶¶ P. 23.

¶¶ Cathar. adv. Cajet. p. 48. ed. Paris. 1535.

plain, Card. Cajetan could never be persuaded of it. But if he means since the Council of Trent, then we are returned to our first difficulty, how such a Council can make any books canonical, which were not received for such by the catholic Church before? For then they do not declare the canon but create it.

XII. *Of the Vulgar Edition of the Bible.*

1. We do not dispute about the vulgar edition,* whether it may not be preferred before modern Latin editions, because of its great antiquity in some parts of it, and its general reception since the time of Gregory I. But our dispute is, whether it be made so authentic since the Council of Trent, that no appeals are to be made to the originals, *i. e.* whether that Council by its authority could make a version equal to the originals out of which it was made? Especially since at the time of that decree, the vulgar edition was confessed to be full of errors and corruptions by Sixtus V.† who saith, he took infinite pains to correct them, and yet left very many behind, as appeared by Clement VIII. who corrected his Bibles in very many places, and grants some faults were left uncorrected still. Now, how was it possible for the Council of Trent to declare that edition authentic, which was afterwards so much corrected? And, whether was the correct edition of Sixtus V. authentic or not, being made in pursuance of the decree of the Council? If not, how comes Clemens's edition to be made authentic, when the other was not, since there may be corruptions found in that, as well as the other; and no one can tell, but it may be reviewed and corrected still; as some of their own writers confess it stands in need of it?‡

2. Our controversy is not so much about the authority of the vulgar Latin above other Latin versions to those who understand them; but whether none else but the Latin version must be used by those who understand it not?§ And here our Representer saith, "that he is commanded not to read any of these translations (speaking of Tindal's,|| and that in Queen Elizabeth's time), but only that which is recommended to him by the Church." If this relate to the vulgar Latin, then we are

* P. 24, 25.

† In hac Vulgata Editione visa sunt nonnulla mutanda, quæ consulto mutata non sunt. Clem. VIII. in Bulla. [Sixtus' edition of the Vulgate appeared in 1560. He anathematized all who should alter it in minima particulâ. Clement VIII. issued his in 1592; and between the two editions there are two thousand differences.]

‡ Luc. Brugens. in variis Lect.

§ Nat. Alexand. Dissert. de vulg. vers. Quæst. 6.

|| P. 26.

to seek, why the common people should have none to read but what they cannot understand ; if to translations of their own, then we doubt not to make it appear, that our translation allowed among us, is more exact and agreeable than any they can put into their hands.

XIII. *Of the Scriptures as a Rule of Faith.*

The only thing insisted on here is, "that it is not the words, but the sense of Scripture is the rule ; and that this sense is not to be taken from men's private fancies, which are various and uncertain ; and therefore where there is no security from errors, there is nothing capable of being a rule."*

To clear this, we must consider,

1. That it is not necessary to the making of a rule, to prevent any possibility of mistake, but that it be such that they cannot mistake without their own fault. For certainty in itself, and sufficiency for the use of others, are all the necessary properties of a rule ; but, after all, it is possible for men not to apply the rule aright, and then they are to be blamed, and not the rule.

2. If no man can be certain of the right sense of Scripture, then it is not plain in necessary things ; which is contrary to the design of it, and to the clearest testimonies of antiquity, and to the common sense of all Christians, who never doubted or disputed the sense of some things revealed therein ; as the unity of the Godhead, the making of the world by him, the deluge, the history of the patriarchs, the captivity of the Jews, the coming of the Messiah, his sending his Apostles, his coming again to judgment, &c. No man who reads such things in Scripture, can have any doubt about the sense and meaning of the words.

Where the sense is dubious, we do not allow any man to put what sense he pleases upon them ; but we say there are certain means, whereby he may either attain to the true sense, or not be damned if he doth not. And the first thing every man is to regard, is not his security from being deceived, but from being damned. For truth is made known in order to salvation ; if therefore I am sure to attain the chief end, I am not so much concerned, as to the possibility of errors, as that I be not deceived by my own fault. We do not therefore leave men either to follow their own fancy, or to interpret Scripture by it ; but we say, they are bound upon pain of damnation to

* P. 27.

seek the truth sincerely, and to use the best means in order to it; and if they do this, they either will not err, or their errors will not be their crime.

XIV. *Of the Interpretation of Scripture.*

1. The question is not, whether men are not bound to make use of the best means for the right interpretation of Scripture, by reading, meditation, prayer, advice, a humble and teachable temper, &c. *i. e.* all the proper means fit for such an end? but whether, after all these, there be a necessity of submitting to some infallible judge, in order to the attaining the certain sense of Scripture?

2. The question is not, whether we ought not to have a mighty regard to the sense of the whole Christian Church in all ages since the Apostles, which we profess to have; but whether the present Roman Church, as it stands divided from other communions, hath such a right and authority to interpret Scripture, that we are bound to believe that to be the infallible sense of Scripture which she delivers.

And here I cannot but take notice how strangely this matter is here misrepresented; for the case is put,

1. As if every one who rejects their pretence of infallibility, had nothing to guide him but his own private fancy in the interpretation of Scripture.*

2. As if we rejected the sense put upon Scripture by the whole community of Christians in all ages since the Apostles' times. Whereas we appeal in the matters in difference between us, to this universal sense of the Christian Church, and are verily persuaded they cannot make it out in any one point wherein we differ from them. And themselves cannot deny, that in several we have plainly the consent of the first ages, as far as appears by the books remaining on our side; as in the worship of images, invocation of saints, Papal supremacy, communion in both kinds, prayer and Scripture in known tongues; and I may safely add, the sufficiency of Scripture, transubstantiation, auricular confession, public communions, solitary masses; to name no more.

But here lies the artifice; we must not pretend to be capable of judging either of Scripture or tradition, but we must trust their judgment what is the sense of Scripture, and what hath been the practice of the Church in all ages, although their own writers confess the contrary; which is very hard.

* P. 29.

But he seems to argue for such a submission to the Church:

1. "Because we receive the books of Scripture from her; therefore from her we are to receive the sense of the books."* An admirable argument! We receive the Old Testament from the Jews, therefore from them we are to receive the sense of the Old Testament; and so we are to reject the true Messiah. But this is not all; if by the Church they mean the Church of Rome in distinction from others, we deny it; if they mean the whole Christian Church, we grant it; but then the force of it is quite lost. But why is it not possible for the Church of Rome to keep these writings, and deliver them to others, which make against herself? Do not persons in lawsuits often produce deeds which make against them? But there is yet a farther reason; it was not possible for the Church of Rome to make away these writings, being so universally spread.

2. Because the Church puts the difference between true and false books, therefore that must be trusted for the true sense of them. Which is just as if one should argue, the Clerks of the Rolls are to give an account to the Court of true Records, therefore they are to sit on the bench, and to give judgment in all causes. The Church is only to declare what it finds as to canonical books; but hath no power to make any book canonical which was not before received for such. But I confess Stapleton saith, the Church, if it please, may make Hermes's Pastor, and Clemens's† Constitutions canonical: but I do not think our author will therein follow him.

XV. *Of Tradition.*

1. The question is not about "human traditions supplying the defects of Scripture,"‡ as he misrepresents it; but whether there be an unwritten word, which we are equally bound to receive with the written word: although these things which pass under that name are really but human traditions, yet we do not deny that they pretend them to be of divine original.

2. We do not deny, but the Apostles might deliver such things by word, as well as by epistle, which their disciples were bound to believe and keep:§ but we think there is some

* P. 29.

† Controv. 5. Qu. 4. art. 2.

‡ P. 30, 31.

§ 2 Thess. ii. 13.

difference to be made between what we certainly know they delivered in writing, and what is now impossible for us to know; *viz.* what they delivered by word without writing.

3. We see no ground why any one should believe any doctrine with a stedfast and divine faith,* which is not bottomed on the written word; for then his faith must be built on the testimony of the Church as divine and infallible, or else his faith cannot be divine. But it is impossible to prove it to be divine and infallible, but by the written word; and therefore, as it is not reasonable that he should believe the written word by such a divine testimony of the Church; so if any particular doctrine may be received on the authority of the Church without the written word, then all articles of faith may, and so there would be no need of the written word.

4. The faith of Christians doth no otherwise stand upon the foundation of the Church's tradition, than as it delivers down to us the books of Scripture;† but we acknowledge the general sense of the Christian Church to be a very great help for understanding the true sense of Scripture; and we do not reject any thing so delivered; but what is all this to the Church of Rome? But this is still the way of true representing.

XVI. *Of Councils.*

1. We are glad to find so good a resolution as seems to be expressed in these words, *viz.* "That he is obliged to believe nothing besides that which Christ taught, and his Apostles; and if any thing contrary to this should be defined, and commanded to be believed, even by ten thousand Councils, he believes it damnable in any one to receive it, and by such decrees to make additions to his Creed."‡ This seems to me a very good saying, and it is a pity any thing else should overthrow it. But here lies the misrepresenting; he will believe what Christ and his Apostles taught, from the definitions of Councils; and so all this goodly fabric falls to nothing; for it is but as if one should say, if Aristotle should falsely deliver Plato's sense, I will never believe him, but I am resolved to take Plato's sense only from Aristotle's words. So here, he first declares he will take the faith of Christ from the Church; and then he saith, if the Church representative should contradict the faith of Christ, he would never believe it.

2. We dispute not with them the right and necessity of

* P. 37.

† P. 32.

‡ P. 33.

General Councils (upon great occasions), if they be truly so, rightfully called, lawfully assembled, and fairly managed; which have been, and may be of great use to the Christian world for settling the faith, healing the breaches of Christendom, and reforming abuses. And we farther say, that the decrees of such Councils ought to be submitted to, where they proceed upon certain grounds of faith, and not upon unwritten traditions; which was the fatal stumbling at the threshold in the Council of Trent, and was not to be recovered afterwards; for their setting up traditions equally with the written word, made it easy for them to define, and as easy for all others to reject their definitions, in case there had not been so many other objections against the proceedings of that Council. And so all our dispute concerning this matter is taken off from the general notion, and runs into the particular debate concerning the qualifications and proceedings of some which were called Free General Councils, but were neither general, nor free; and therefore could not deliver the sense of the catholic Church, which our author requires them to do.*

XVII. *Of Infallibility in the Church.*

1. He doth not pretend this belongs to the pastors and prelates of his Church, who may fall, he saith, into heresy and schism; but that the whole Church is secured by divine promises from all error and danger of prevarication;† which he proves from the promises of the New Testament, Matth. xvi. 18; xxviii. 20. John xiv. 16, 26. But however the former seems to take away infallibility from the guides of the Church, yet that this is to be understood of them separately, appears by what follows.

2. The like assistance of the Holy Ghost he believes to be in all General Councils, which is the Church representative; by which they are specially protected from all error in all definitions and declarations in matters of faith.‡

Now here are two sorts of infallibility tacked to one another by virtue of these general promises, which ought more distinctly to be considered.

1. To preserve Christ's Church so as it shall never cease to be a Church, is one thing; to preserve it from all error is another; the former answers the end of Christ's promises as to the duration of the Church; and the latter is not implied in them.

* P. 33.

† P. 36.

‡ P. 38.

2. The promise of teaching them all truth, John xvi. 13, is not made to the whole Church, but to the Apostles : and their case was so peculiar and extraordinary, that there can be no just inference from the assistance promised to them, of what the Church should enjoy in all ages.

3. If the diffusive Church have no infallible assistance promised, then no infallible assistance can from thence be proved for the Church representative ; so that some particular promises to the guides of the Church as assembled together, are necessary to prove the infallibility of Councils.

4. It by no means proves following Councils to be infallible, because the Apostles said, Acts xv. 28, "It seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us."* Our author doth not doubt but the same may be prefixed to all determinations in point of faith, resolved on by any General Council lawfully assembled since that time, or to be held to the world's end. But what reason he had for not doubting in this matter, I cannot see ; the assistance, he saith, being to extend as far as the promise : but shall assistance imply infallibility ? Then there must be good store, as long as the promises of divine grace hold good : but this assistance of Councils is very different from the assistance of grace ; for the Church may subsist without Councils, but cannot without grace : what General Council was there from the meeting, Acts xv. to the Council of Nice ? Were not Christ's promises fulfilled to his Church all that time, when it increased in all parts against the most violent opposition ?

5. No parity of reason from the Jewish Church can be of sufficient proof for infallibility in the Christian. But our author argues thus, "If God's special assistance was never wanting to the Church of the Jews, so as to let it fail in the truth of its doctrine, or its authority ; why should not he believe the same of the Church of Christ, which is built on better promises ?"† What special assistance was it which Israel had, when it is said, that for a long time Israel had been without the true God, and without a teaching priest, and without law?‡ And as to Judah, was there no failing in point of doctrine in our Saviour's time ? It is true they had the law entire, and that was all that was good among them ; for their teachers had corrupted themselves and the people, and made the law of no effect among them : if there were

* P. 38.

† P. 39.

‡ 2 Chron. xv. 3.

infallibility any where, it must be in the high-priest and Sanhedrim; but is it possible for any Christian to think them infallible, when they were so grossly mistaken about the main article of their faith as to the Messiah, and pronounced him worthy of death? Is not this a fine argument for the infallibility of the guides of the Christian Church? But the Church of Christ hath better promises: no doubt of it, greater promises of grace and mercy in this world, and in that to come: but what is all this to infallibility in Councils?

6. Christ's command of obedience to those who sat in Moses' chair (Matth. xxiii. 2), doth not prove the infallibility of those who sat there. Yet this is alleged to that purpose; and that men ought not to doubt of the reasonableness of the commands of their superiors.* But St. Chrysostom† saith, 'our Saviour speaks of the things commanded by the law of Moses.' " *Per cathedram doctrinam legis ostendit,*" saith St. Jerome:‡ "Not their own doctrine, but that of Moses," saith Isidore; and so Hilary§ and Theophylact.|| Maldonate confesseth, our Saviour's words are to be understood, not of their own doctrine, but of that of the law; and therefore he yields the obedience here required is to be restrained to that. "All things," saith Cajetan, "which they teach out of Moses's chair." "Not all their doctrines, but as far as they were conformable to the law," saith Ferus. Now, can any one hence infer, that no men ought to dispute any commands of superiors, when it is supposed, that there is a rule and standard for them to speak according to? And our Saviour elsewhere doth suppose these very men to teach things contrary to the law; as in the case of *corban*.¶ Would our Saviour contradict himself? or require a blind obedience in things repugnant to the law? We do not deny a due submission to our superiors in the Church; yea, we allow them a power to determine things not forbidden; and think obedience due in such things by virtue of their authority; but yet this is far enough from infallibility, or an unlimited implicit obedience, which would overthrow the force of all our Saviour's reasonings against the Scribes and Pharisees, as to their misinterpreting the law, and the superstitious practices they imposed upon the people.

* P. 39.

† Chrysost. in Matth. Hom. 72. [vol. 7. p. 790. Par. 1837.]

‡ Hieron. in loc. [vol. 7. p. 182. Veron. 1737.] Cat. Gr. in loc.

§ Hilar. Canon. 24.

|| Theophylact. in loc. [vol. 9. p. 122. Venet. 1754.] ¶ Matth. xv.

XVIII. *Of the Pope.*

1. We do not charge them with believing the Pope to be God; which it seems himself did, if we believe the Misrepresenter in his Preface; but there is some reason to doubt whether they do not at some times give him greater honour than becomes a man. I instance in the adoration after his election,* when the new Pope is placed upon the altar to receive the submissions of the cardinals; but the altar, themselves do confess to be sacred to God alone; and there they profess to worship Jesus Christ, as present in the host. This, therefore, looks too much like assuming the place of Christ, and not becoming the distance between God and man.

2. The question is, whether Christ hath appointed the Pope or Bishop of Rome to be pastor, governor, and head of his Church under him?† This, he saith, he believes, and this he knows we deny, and therefore had reason to expect some proof of it. But instead thereof, he tells us how they look on themselves as obliged to shew him the respect due to his place, which he knows is not the matter in question. Two things, however, he saith, which seem to justify his title.

1. He is the successor of St. Peter,‡ to whom Christ committed the charge of his flock. But how far is this from proving the Pope to be head of the Church under Christ? For, how doth it appear that Christ ever made St. Peter head of the Church, or committed his flock to him, in contradistinction to the rest of the Apostles? This is so far from being evident from Scripture, that the learned men of their Church are ashamed of the places commonly produced for it; it being impossible ever to justify the sense of them according to their own rules of interpreting Scripture, viz. by the unanimous consent of the Fathers. For, 1, “Thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build my Church,”§ is interpreted by many of the Fathers, both Greek and Latin, of St. Peter’s confession, and not of his person; so by St. Chrysostom,|| St. Ambrose,¶ St. Augustine,** St. Basil of Seleucia,†† St. Hilary,‡‡ St. Gregory

* Cerem. Sect. 1. c. 2.

† P. 40.

‡ P. 41.

§ Matth. xvi. 18.

|| Chrysost. Hom. 1. in Pentec. tom. 5. ed. Savil. p. 979.

¶ Ambros. de Incarn. Dom. Sacramento, c. 5. [vol. 2. p. 711. Par. 1690.]

** Aug. de Verbis Dom. ad Evang. secund. 13. [vol. 5. p. 416. Par. 1683.] Tract. in Joh. 124. [Ibid. vol. 3. par. 2. p. 822.]

†† Basil. Seleuc. Orat. 25. ad fin. [p. 142. Par. 1622.]

‡‡ Hilar. de Trinit. 1. 6. [ut supra, vol. 2. p. 160.]

Nyssen,* and Theodoret;† all great and considerable persons in the Christian Church, whose words are plain and full to that purpose; and so they can never produce the unanimous consent of the Fathers for St. Peter's supremacy out of these words. "And unto thee will I give the keys of the kingdom of heaven,"‡ are interpreted by the Fathers, of St. Peter in common with the other Apostles; so Origen,§ St. Cyprian,|| St. Hilary,¶ St. Jerome,** and St. Augustine,†† as they are all owned by a member of the Roman communion. And, 3. For these words, "Feed my sheep," a late learned doctor of the Sorbonne shews, that if they prove any thing peculiar to St. Peter, they must prove him sole pastor to the Church, which was the thing St. Gregory disputed against so warmly. But that there was nothing peculiar to St. Peter, above or beyond the rest of the Apostles, he shews at large from St. Chrysostom, St. Cyril, St. Augustine, and others, to whom I refer the reader, and to the former authors.†† But suppose it were made to appear that St. Peter was head of the Church, how doth the bishop of Rome's succession in that headship shew itself? To that he saith, 2. That there hath been a visible succession of above two hundred and fifty bishops, acknowledged as such in all past ages by the Christian world.§§ "As such:" what is that? As bishops of Rome? That is not of weight enough to put it upon trial, "as heads of the catholic Church?" That he knows is not only denied by us, but by all the Greek, Armenian, Nestorian, Abyssinian Churches; so that we dare say, it was never allowed in any one age of the Christian Church. But we need not insist on the proof of this, since the late mentioned authors of the Roman communion have taken so great

* Greg. Nyssen de Advent. Domini, cap. ult. [vol. 2. p. 162. Par. 1638.]

† Theodoret Epist. 77. 146. [vol. 4. p. 1130. 1262. Hal. 1771.]

‡ Matth. xvi. 19.

§ Orig. Comment. in Matt. Gr. Lat. p. 275. [vol. 3. p. 525. Par. 1740.]

|| Cyprian. de Unit. Ecclesiae. [p. 397. Venet. 1728.]

¶ Hilar. de Trinit. l. 6. [ut supra.]

** Hier. c. Jovin. l. 1. c. 14. in Matth. xvi. [vol. 2. p. 279. vol. 7. p. 124. Veron. 1735, &c.]

†† Aug. in Joh. Tr. 118. 124. [ut supra, p. 800. 822.] in Epist. Joh. to. 10. [Tr. 10.] [Ibid. p. 894.]

‡‡ Moyens surs et honestes, p. 34, &c. Entretiens de Philaleth. in Philirene, p. 121.

§§ Joh. Launoi, Epist. part. 5. Reim. formentino, et part. 2. Ep. 5. p. 47, &c.

pains, not only to prove the Pope's supremacy to be an encroachment and usurpation in the Church, but that the laying it aside is necessary to the peace and unity of it. And until the Divine institution of the Papal supremacy be proved, it is to no purpose to debate what manner of assistance is promised to the Pope in his decrees. Our author* is willing to decline the debate about his personal infallibility, as a matter of opinion, and not of faith; and yet he saith, he doubts not but God doth grant a special assistance to the high-priest, for the good of the whole flock, under the new law, as he did under the old; and produces the instance of Caiaphas, John xi. 51. This is a very surprising way of reasoning; for if his arguments be good from Scripture, he must hold the Pope's personal infallibility as a matter of faith; and yet one would hardly think he should build an article of faith on the instance of Caiaphas: for what consequence can be drawn from God's overruling the mind of a very bad man, when he was carrying on a most wicked design, to utter such words which in the event proved true in another sense than he meant them; that therefore God will give a special assistance to the Pope in determining matters of faith? Was not Caiaphas himself the man who proposed the taking away the life of Christ at that time? Was he assisted at that council? Did not he determine afterwards Christ to be guilty of blasphemy, and therefore worthy of death? And is not this a rare infallibility which is supposed to be consistent with a decree to crucify Christ? And doth he in earnest think such orders are to be obeyed, whether the supreme pastor be infallible or not? For so he concludes, "that his sentence is to be obeyed, whether he be infallible or no."

XIX. *Of Dispensations.*

Here the Misrepresenter saith, that a Papist believes the Pope hath authority to dispense with the laws of God, and absolve any one from the obligation of keeping the commandments.† On the other side, the Representer affirms, that the Pope has no authority to dispense with the law of God, and that there is no power upon earth can absolve any one from the obligation of keeping the commandments. This matter is not to be determined by the one's affirming, and the other's denying; but by finding out, if possible, the true sense of the

* P. 42.

† P. 43.

Church of Rome about this matter. And there are three opinions about it.

1. Of those who assert, that the Pope hath a power of dispensing in any divine law, except the Articles of Faith,* the Gloss upon the canon law saith, that where the text seems to imply, that the Pope cannot dispense against the Apostle, it is to be understood of articles of faith: and Panormitan saith, this exposition pleases him well; for the Pope may dispense in all other things: *Contra Apostolum dispensat*, saith the Gloss on the decree: and the Roman editors in the margin refer to 34 *Dist. c. Lector.* to prove it: and there indeed the Gloss is very plain in the case, *sic ergo papa dispensat contra Apostolum*: and the Roman correctors there justify it, and say it is no absurd doctrine as to positive institutions: but the former notable Gloss, as Panormitan calls it, sets down the particulars wherein the Pope may dispense. As, 1. Against the Apostles and their canons.† 2. Against the Old Testament. 3. In vows. 4. In oaths. The *Summa Angelica* saith, the Pope may dispense as to all the precepts of the Old Testament. And Clivasaus founds this power upon the plenitude of the Pope's power, according to that expression in the decretal mentioned, that he can, *ex plenitudine potestatis de jure supra jus dispensare*; and without such a power, he saith, God would not have taken that care of his Church, which was to be expected from his wisdom. Jacobatius brings several instances of this power in the Pope, and refers to the *Speculator* for more.‡ Jac. Almain saith, that all the canonists are of opinion that the Pope may dispense against the Apostle; and many of their divines, but not all:§ for,

2. Some of their divines held that the Pope could not dispense with the law of God, as that implies a proper relaxation of the law, but could only authoritatively declare that the law did not oblige in such a particular case; because an inferior could not take away the force of a superior's law; and otherwise there would be no fixed and immutable rule in the Church; and if the Pope might dispense in one law of God, he might dispense in the rest: and of this opinion were some of the

* De Concess. præbend. è. proposuit Abb. c. proposuit de Conc. Præbend. c. 15. Q. 6. c. Auctoritate.

† Sum. Angelic. v. dispensatio.

‡ Jacobat. de Conciliis, l. 5. p. 215.

§ Almain. de Potest. Ecclesiæ, c. 13.

most eminent school divines, as Thomas Aquinas, Bonaventure, Major, Soto, and Catharinus,* who at large debates this question, and denies that the Pope hath any power to dispense with God's law: but then he adds, that the Pope hath a kind of prophetic power to declare in what cases the law doth oblige, and in what not; which he parallels with the power of declaring the canon of Scripture; and this he doth not by his own authority, but by God's; he confesseth the Pope cannot dispense with those precepts which are of themselves indispensable; nor alter the sacraments; but then, saith he, there are some divine laws, which have a general force, but in particular cases may be dispensed with; and in these cases the law is to be relaxed, so that the relaxation seems to come from God himself; but he confesses this power is not to be often made use of; so that he makes this power to be no act of jurisdiction, but of prophetic interpretation, as he calls it; and he brings the instance of Caiaphas to this purpose, and he adds, that the difference between the divines and canonists was but in terms; for the canonists were in the right as to the power, and the divines in the manner of explaining it.

3. Others have thought this too loose a way of explaining the Pope's power, and therefore they say, that the Pope hath not a bare declaratory power, but a real power of dispensing in a proper sense in particular cases: for say they, the other is no act of jurisdiction, but of discretion, and may belong to other men as well as to the Pope; but this they look on as agreeable to the Pope's authority and commission? and a bare declaratory power would not be sufficient for the Church's necessity; as Sanchez shews at large,† and quotes many authors for this opinion, and Sayr. more; and he saith, the practice of the Church cannot be justified without it, which Suarez much insists upon;‡ and without it, he saith, the Church hath fallen into intolerable errors; and it is evident, he saith, the Church hath granted real dispensations, and not mere declarations. And he founds it upon Christ's promise to Peter, "To thee will I give the keys," and the charge to him, "Feed my sheep." But then he explains this opinion, by saying, that it is no formal dispensation with the law of God, but the matter of the law is changed or taken away.

* Catharin. c. Cajetan. 6. p. 524. [Par. 1535.]

† Sanchez. de Matrim. l. 8. Disp. 6. n. 5. Sayr. Clavis. Reg. l. 6. c. 11.

‡ Suarez. de vot. l. 6. c. 9. n. 7, 8, 9, 17.

Thus I have briefly laid together the different opinions in the Church of Rome about this power of dispensing with the law of God; from which it appears, that they do all consent in the thing, but differ only in the manner of explaining it.

And I am therefore afraid our Representer is a very unstudied divine, and doth not well understand their own doctrine, or he would never have talked so boldly and unskillfully in this matter.

As to what he pretends, that "their Church teacheth that every lie is a sin," &c. it doth not reach the case; for the question is not, whether their Church teach men to lie, but whether there be not such a power in the Church, as by altering the nature of things, may not make that not to be a lie, which otherwise would be one: as their Church teaches that men ought not to break their vows; yet no one among them questions, but the Pope may dissolve the obligation of a vow, although it be made to God himself. Let him shew then, how the Pope comes to have a power to release a vow made to God, and not to have a power to release the obligation to veracity among men.

Again, we do not charge them with delivering any such doctrine, "that men may have dispensations to lie and forswear themselves at pleasure;"* for we know this dispensing power is to be kept up as a great mystery, and not to be made use of, but upon weighty and urgent causes, of great consequence and benefit to the Church, as their doctors declare. But as to all matters of fact, which he alludes to, I have nothing to say to them; for our debate is only, whether there be such a power of dispensation allowed in the Church of Rome or not?

XX. *Of the Deposing Power.*

To bring this matter into as narrow a compass as may be, I shall first take notice of his concessions, which will save us a labour of proofs.

1. He yields† that the deposing and king-killing power hath been maintained by some canonists and divines of his Church, and that it is in their opinion lawful, and annexed to the Papal chair.

2 That some Popes have endeavoured to act according to this power.

* P. 45.

† P. 46.

But then he denies that this doctrine appertains to the faith of his Church, and is to be believed by all of that communion. And more than that, he saith, the affirming of it is a malicious calumny, a downright falsity.

Let us now calmly debate the matter, whether according to the received principles of the Church of Rome, this be only a particular opinion of some Popes and divines, or be to be received as a matter of faith. The question is not

Whether those who deny it, do account it an article of faith; for we know they do not; but whether upon the principles of the Church of Rome they are not bound to do it.

I shall only, to avoid cavilling, proceed upon the principles owned by our author himself, *viz.*

1. That the sense of Scripture,* as understood by the community of Christians in all ages since the Apostles, is to be taken from the present Church.

2. That by the present Church† he understands the pastors and prelates assembled in councils, who are appointed by Christ and his Apostles for the decision of controversies; and that they have infallible assistance.

3. That the Pope,‡ as head of the Church, hath a particular assistance promised him, with a special regard to his office and function.

If therefore it appear that Popes and Councils have declared this deposing doctrine, and they have received other things as articles of faith upon the same declarations, why should they then stick at yielding this to be an article of faith, as well as the other?

It is not denied, that I can find, that Popes and Councils for several ages have asserted and exercised the deposing power; but it is alleged against these decrees and acts, 1. That they were not grounded upon universal tradition. 2. That they had not universal reception.

Now, if these be sufficient to overthrow the definitions of Councils, let us consider the consequences of it.

1. Then every man is left to examine the decrees of Councils, whether they are to be embraced or not: for he is to judge whether they are founded on universal tradition; and so he is not to take the sense of the present Church for his guide, but the universal Church from Christ's time: which overthrows a fundamental principle of the Roman Church.

2. Then he must reject the pretended infallibility in the

* P. 29.

† P. 34.

‡ P. 40, 41.

guides of the Church, if they could so notoriously err in a matter of so great consequence to the peace of Christendom, as this was; and consequently their authority could not be sufficient to declare any articles of faith. And so all persons must be left at liberty to believe as they see cause, notwithstanding the definitions made by Popes and Councils.

3. Then he must believe the guides of the Roman Church to have been mistaken, not once or twice, but to have persisted in it for five hundred years, which must take away, not only infallibility, but any kind of reverence to the authority of it. For whatever may be said as to those who have depended on princes, or favour their parties against the guides of the Church, it cannot be denied that for so long time the leading party in that Church did assert and maintain the deposing power. And therefore Lessius* truly understood this matter, when he said, that there was scarce any article of the Christian faith, the denial whereof was more dangerous to the Church, or did precipitate men more into heresy and hatred of the Church, than this of the deposing power; for, he says, they could not maintain their Church's authority without it.

And he reckons up these ill consequences of denying it.†

1. That the Roman Church hath erred for at least five hundred years, in a matter fundamental as to government, and of great moment: which is worse than an error about sacraments, as penance, extreme unction, &c. and yet those who deny the Church can err in one, hold that it hath erred in a greater matter.

2. That it hath not only erred, but voluntarily and out of ambition, perverting out of design the doctrine of the Primitive Church and Fathers concerning the power of the Church, and bringing in another contrary to it, against the right and authority of princes; which were a grievous sin.

3. That it made knowingly unrighteous decrees, to draw persons from their allegiance to princes; and so they became the causes of many seditions and rebellions, and all the ill consequences of them, under a show of piety and religion.

4. That the Church's decrees, commands, judgments and censures may be safely contemned as null, and containing intolerable errors, and that it may require such things which good subjects are bound to disobey.

5. That Gregory VII. in the canon *Nos Sanctorum*, &c.

* Discussio Decreti Magni Concil. Lateran. p. 89.

† P. 90, &c.

Urban II. Gregory IX. the Councils of Lateran under Alex. III. and Innocent III. the Councils of Lyons, of Vienna, of Constance, of Lateran under Leo X. and of Trent, have all grievously and enormously erred about this matter; for that it was the doctrine of them all, he shews at large; and so seven General Councils lose their infallibility at one blow.

6. That the gates of hell have prevailed against the Church: for the true Church could never teach such pernicious doctrine as this must be if it be not true. And if it erred in this, it might as well err in any other doctrine, and so men are not bound to believe or obey it.

7. That princes and all laymen have just cause to withdraw from their Church; because it shewed itself to be governed by a spirit of ambition, and not by the Spirit of God; and not only so, but they may justly prosecute all that maintain a doctrine so pernicious to government, if it be not true.

Let us now see what our author saith to clear this from being a doctrine of the Church of Rome.

1. That for the few authors that are abettors of this doctrine there are of his communion three times the number that publicly disown all such authority.

If this be true, it is not much for the reputation of their Church, that there should be such a number of those who are liable to all those dreadful consequences, which Lessius urges upon the deniers of it: but is it possible to believe there should be so few followers of so many Popes, and seven General Councils, owned for such by the disowners of this* doctrine, except the Lateran under Leo X.? The poor Eastern Christians are condemned for heretics by the Church of Rome, for refusing to submit to the decrees of one General Council, either that of Ephesus or of Chalcedon: and they plead for themselves, that there was a misinterpretation of their meaning, or not right understanding one another about the difference of Nature and Person,† which occasioned those decrees. I would fain know, whether those Churches which do not embrace the decrees of those Councils, are in a state of heresy or not? If they be, then what must we think of such who reject the decrees of seven General Councils, one after another, and give far less probable accounts of the proceedings of those Councils in their definitions, than the other do?

* Discuss. Discuss. Part. 3. sect. 3. p. 1.

† Philip. a SS. Trinit. Itiner. Orient. 1. 5. c. 5. Clem. Galan. Concil. Eccl. Arm. Qu. 2. SS. 3. [vol. 2.] p. 92. [Rom. 1658.]

2. He saith, "those who have condemned it have not been in the least suspected of their religion, or of denying any article of faith." Let any one judge of this by Lessius's consequences: and the author of the first treatise against the oath of allegiance, saith in plain terms,* that the opinion that the Pope hath no such power, is erroneous in faith, as well as temerarious and impious. And he proves it by this substantial argument; because they who hold it must suppose, that the Church hath been for some time in a damnable error of belief, and sin of practice: and he not only proves that it was defined by Popes and Councils, but for a long time universally received; and that no one author can be produced before Calvin's time that denied this power absolutely, or in any case whatsoever. "But a few authors that are abettors of it,"† saith our Representer: "Not one total dissenter for a long time," saith the other: and which of these is the true representer? "The deniers of it not in the least suspected of their religion," saith one: "Their opinion is erroneous in faith, temerarious and impious," saith the other.

If we charge their Church with this opinion, may not they as well charge ours with the like, since propositions as dangerous were condemned at Oxford, July 26, 1683, as held not by Jesuits,‡ but by some among ourselves? This is the force of his reasoning: but we must desire the reader to consider the great disparity of the case. We cannot deny that there have been men of ill minds, and disloyal principles, factious and disobedient, enemies to the government both in church and state; but have these men ever had that countenance from the doctrines of the guides of our Church, which the deposing doctrine hath had in the Church of Rome? To make the case parallel, he must suppose our Houses of Convocation to have several times declared these damnable doctrines, and given encouragement to rebels to proceed against their kings, and the University of Oxford to have condemned them; for this is truly the case in the Church of Rome; the Popes and Councils have owned, and approved, and acted by the deposing principle, but the Universities of France, of late years, have condemned it.

* Jesuit's Loyalty, first Treatise, p. 1, &c.

† A professor of Lovain, now living, hath undertaken to shew, that the number is far greater of those who assert this doctrine than of those who deny it.

‡ Auctoritas sedis. Apostolicæ vindicata adversus Natal. Alexand. per Francisc. D'Enghien. Colon. A. D. 1684.

How comes the principles of the regicides among us to be parallel with this doctrine, when the principles of our Church are so directly contrary to them ; and our Houses of Convocation would as readily condemn any such damnable doctrines as the University of Oxford ? And all the world knows how repugnant such principles are to those of the Church of England ; and none can be rebels to their prince but they must be false to our Church.

As to the personal loyalty of many persons in that Church, as I have no reason to question it, so it is not proper for me to debate it, if I did ; since our business is not concerning persons but doctrines ; and it was of old observed concerning the Epicureans, that though their principles did overthrow any true friendship, yet many of them made excellent friends.

XXI. *Of Communion in one Kind.*

For our better proceeding in this controversy, I shall set down the state of it as clearly as I can.

1. The question is not, whether the first institution of the sacrament of the eucharist by Jesus Christ, were in one kind, or two ; for all confess it was under both kinds.

2. It is not, whether both kinds are not still necessary for the due celebration of it ; for it is granted that both kinds are necessary to be upon the altar, or else there could be no complete sacrifice.

3. It is not, whether the people may be wholly excluded from both kinds, and so the sacrifice only remain ; for they grant that the people are bound to communicate in one kind

4. It is not concerning any peculiar and extraordinary cases, where no wine is to be had, or if there be a particular aversion to it, or any such thing, where positive institutions may be reasonably presumed to have no force ; but concerning the public and solemn celebration, and participation of it in the Christian Church.

5. It is not concerning the mere disuse or neglect of it, but concerning the lawfulness of excluding the people from both kinds, by the Church's prohibition, notwithstanding the institution of it by Christ in both kinds, with a command to keep up the celebration of it to his second coming.

Here now consists the point in controversy, whether the Church being obliged to keep up the institution in both kinds, be not equally obliged to distribute both as our Saviour did, to as many as partake of it ? Our author, not denying the insti-

tution, or the continuance of it, saith, our Saviour left it indifferent to receive it in one kind, or both. And that is the point to be examined.

1. He saith, "Christ delivered it to his Apostles, who only were then present, and whom he made priests just before; yet he gave no command that it should be so received by all the faithful."

But were not the Apostles all the faithful then present? I pray in what capacity did they then receive it? As priests? How did they receive the bread before the *hoc facite*? As priests or as faithful? It is ridiculous to suppose the *hoc facite* changed their capacity; and if it did, it only relates to consecrating, and not to receiving: but if Christ gave it only to the Apostles as priests, then for all that I can see, the people are not at all concerned in one kind or other; but it was intended only for priests: if the people be concerned, how came they to be so? Where is there any command but what refers to the first institution? And it had been more plausible, according to this answer, to exclude the people wholly, than to admit them to one kind, and to debar them the other.

2. "Christ attributes the obtaining life everlasting, the end of the institution, sometimes to receiving under both kinds, sometimes under one, John vi. 51, 57, 58." He could not easily have thought of any thing more against himself; for our Saviour there makes it as necessary to drink his blood, as to eat his flesh, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you."* If this be understood of the sacrament, as he saith, how is it possible for him to make the cup indifferent? unless it be indifferent whether the people may be saved or not.

3. "Christ himself administered the sacrament to some of his disciples under one kind only, Luke xxiv. 20." But is he sure Christ did then administer the sacrament to them? or that if he did, the cup was not implied, since breaking of bread, when taken for an ordinary meal in Scripture, doth not exclude drinking at it? But St. Augustine, he saith, (l. 49. *de Consensu Evangel.*) understands that place of the sacrament. If he doth, it cannot be where he saith; for St. Augustine wrote but four books of that subject; but l. 3. 25. he doth say something towards it; yet St. Augustine in another place supposes that these disciples did both eat and drink. "The disciples

* St. John vi. 51.

did not know him, but in the breaking of bread; and truly he that doth not eat and drink judgment to himself, doth in the breaking of bread own Christ."* Where it is plain, that he applies both, to the breaking of bread here spoken of.

4. He saith, it was the custom of the primitive Christians to give it under one kind to children, the sick, and to men in a journey. I would he had produced his authorities to prove these things; for I can bring several to prove the direct contrary as to children, and sick persons, and travellers, and not only ancient writers, but the most learned of their own Church. And therefore I cannot but wonder to find him saying, "this was attested by all ancient writers and modern historians;" but I have ever found those have been most mistaken, who produce "all writers and historians," when it may be, there is not one that speaks home to the business. At least, we have here none mentioned, and therefore none to examine; and it would be too hard a task, to search all.

5. He adds to this extravagancy, in saying, "that receiving in one or both kinds, was indifferent for the first four hundred years;" when the contrary is so manifest, that the most ingenuous of their own writers confess it. If any persons did carry home one kind (which is very questionable; for Baronius and Albaspinæus say, they carried both kinds) to receive it in times of persecution, at what season they thought fit afterwards; this ought not to be set up against the general and constant rule of the Church; which is attested, not only by Cassander and such like, but even by Salmero, Ruardus, Tapperus, and Lindanus, who make no scruple of saying, the public celebration in the Primitive Church was in both kinds. But then, how is it possible for us to judge better, what they thought themselves bound to do, than by what they constantly observed in all their public celebrations? The Church is not accountable for the particular fancies or superstitions of men; but by what was observed in all public offices, we have reason to think the Church thought itself obliged so to do, out of regard to the institution of Christ. And to shew how universal this observation was in the Church, those who give account of the Eastern Church say, that the Greeks, Nestorians, Armenians, Maronites, Cophtites and Abyssinians,† do all observe it still, *viz.* that the public communicants do par-

* Tract. 2. in Epist. St. John. [vol. 3. par. 1. p. 835. Par. 1680.]

† Cotovic. Itiner. Hierosolymit. 1. 2. c. 6. [p. 198, &c. Antv. 1619.]

take of both kinds.* And not one of all these Churches but think themselves bound to observe it, out of regard to the institution of Christ; and why then should any think the Primitive Church thought it indifferent?

6. "The first precept of receiving under both kinds, was given to the faithful by Pope Leo, A. D. 443, and confirmed by Gelasius, A. D. 490." This is a great mistake, for Leo gave no precept about it; but only told the people how they might certainly discover the Manichees, for they would conform in other things, but they would not taste of the wine: which argued, that all other communicants did then partake in both kinds. Gelasius not only confirms the custom then used, but he saith, that it is sacrilege to divide that holy mystery. And surely he did not account sacrilege an indifferent thing.

7. Lastly, he saith, "that those who receive in one kind, are truly partakers of the whole sacrament."† This is a new way of concomitancy; we used to hear of whole Christ under either species, and that whole Christ was therefore received; but how comes it to be the whole sacrament, which consists of two distinct parts? And if it be a sacrifice, the blood must be separated from the body, else the blood of Christ is not considered as shed, and so the notion of the sacrifice will be lost: which is our next head.

XXII. *Of the Mass.*

Under this head, which is thought of so great consequence in the Roman Church, I expected a fuller representation than I here find; as about the *Opus Operatum*, i. e. how far the mere act is effectual; about their solitary masses, when no person receives but the priest; about the people having so little to do, or understand, in all the other parts of the mass; about the rites and ceremonies of the mass, how useful and important they are; about reconciling the present canon of the mass with the present practices; about offering up masses for the honour of saints. All which we find in the Council of Trent, but are omitted by our Representer; who speaks of the mass, as though there were no controversy about it, but only concerning the sacrifice there supposed to be offered up, and which is far from true representing; for the Council of Trent‡ not

* *Histoire Critique*, p. 14.

† P. 52.

‡ Sess. 22. cap. 2. can. 1, 2, 3, &c. [Labbe, *ut supra*, vol. 14. p. 853. 855.]

only affirms a true proper propitiatory sacrifice to be there offered up for the quick and dead, but denounces anathemas against those that deny it. So that the question is not, whether the eucharist may not in the sense of antiquity be allowed to be a commemorative sacrifice, as it takes in the whole action; but whether in the mass there be such a representation made to God of Christ's sacrifice, as to be itself a true and propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of the quick and the dead?

Now all that our Representer saith to the purpose, is,

1. "That Christ bequeathed his body and blood at his last supper, under the species of bread and wine, not only a sacrament, but also a sacrifice."* I had thought it had been more proper to have offered a sacrifice than to have bequeathed it. And this ought to have been proved, as the foundation of this sacrifice, *viz.* that Christ did at his last supper offer up his body and blood, as a propitiatory sacrifice to God. And then what need his suffering on the cross?

2. "He gave this in charge to his Apostles, as the first and chief priests of the New Testament, and to their successors, to offer." But where? when? and how? For we read nothing at all of it in Scripture. Christ indeed did bid them do the same thing he had there done in his last supper. But did he then offer up himself, or not? If not, how can the sacrifice be drawn from his action? If he did, it is impossible to prove the necessity of his dying afterwards.

3. "This sacrifice was never questioned till of late years." We say, it was never determined to be a propitiatory sacrifice, till of late. We do not deny the Fathers interpreting Mal. i. 11, of an offering under the Gospel; but they generally understand it of spiritual and eucharistical sacrifices; and although some of them, by way of accommodation, do apply it to the eucharist, yet not one of them doth make it a propitiatory sacrifice, which was the thing to be proved: for, we have no mind to dispute about metaphorical sacrifices, when the Council of Trent so positively decrees it to be a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice.

XXIII. *Of Purgatory.*

Here our author begins with proving from Scripture and antiquity, and then undertakes to explain the doctrine of purgatory from substantial reasons.

I. As to his proof from Scripture.

1. Is that from 2 Maccab. xii. where he saith, "Money was sent to Jerusalem, that sacrifices might be offered for the slain; and it is recommended as a holy cogitation, to pray for the dead."

To this, which is the main foundation of purgatory,* I answer, 1. It can never prove such a purgatory as our author asserts; for he supposes a sinner reconciled to God, as to eternal punishment, before he be capable of purgatory; but here can be no such supposition; for these men died in the sin of Achan, which was not known till their bodies were found among the slain. Here was no confession, or any sign of repentance, and therefore if it proves any thing, it is deliverance from eternal punishment, and for such as die in their sins without any show of repentance. 2. We must distinguish the fact of Judas from the interpretation of Jason, or his epitomizer. The fact of Judas was according to the strictness of the law, which required, in such cases, a *sin-offering*; and that is all which the Greek implies, Ἀπέστειλεν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα προσαγαγεῖν περὶ ἁμαρτίας Θυσίαν. And so Leo Allatius† confesses all the best Greek copies agree; and he reckons twelve of them. Now what doth this imply, but that Judas, remembering the severe punishment of this sin in the case of Achan, upon the people, sent a sin-offering to Jerusalem? "But," saith Leo Allatius, "it was the sin of those men that were slain." I grant it. But the question is, whether the sin-offering‡ respected the dead or the living? For the law in such a case required a sin-offering for the congregation. And why should not we believe so punctual a man for the law, as Judas, did strictly observe it in this point? But the author of the book of Maccabees understands it of those that were slain. I do not deny it; but then, 3. We have no reason to rely upon his authority in this matter; which I shall make appear by a parallel instance. He doth undoubtedly commend the fact of Razias in killing himself (2 Macc. xiv. 42), when he saith he did it ἐν γενῶς, like a brave man; and if he had thought it a fault in him, he would never have given such a character of it, but he would have added something of caution after it. And it is no great advantage to purgatory, for him that commends self-murder to have introduced it. The most probable account I can give of it is, that the Alexandrian Jews,

* P. 57.

† Leo Allat. de Purgat. p. 889.

‡ Levit. iv. 13.

of whose number Jason of Cyrene seems to have been, had taken in several of the philosophical opinions, especially the Platonists, into their religion, as appears by Philo; and Bellarmine* himself confesses, that Plato held a purgatory; and they were ready to apply what related to the law, to their Platonic notions. So here the law appointed a sin-offering with respect to the living; but Jason would needs have this refer to the dead; and then sets down his own remark upon it, "that it was a holy cogitation to pray for the dead;" as our author renders it. If it were holy with respect to the law, there must be some ground for it in the law. And that we appeal to: and do not think any particular fancies sufficient to introduce such a novelty as this was, which had no foundation either in the law or the prophets. And it would be strange for a new doctrine to be set up, when the spirit of prophecy was ceased among them.

But St. Augustine held these books for canonical, and saith, "they are so received by the Church," l. 18. *de Civit. Dei*. To answer this, it is sufficient to observe, not only the different opinions of others before mentioned as to these books; but that as Canus notes,† it was then lawful to doubt of their authority: and he goes as low as Gregory I.‡ whom he denies not to have rejected them. And I hope we may set the authority of one against the other; especially when St. Augustine§ himself, being pressed hard with the fact of Razias, confesses, 1. "That the Jews have not the book of Maccabees in their canon, as they have the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms, to whom our Lord gave testimony as to his witnesses." Which is an evident proof, he thought not these books sufficient to ground a doctrine upon, which was not found in the other. 2. "That however this book was not unprofitably received by the Church, if it be soberly read and heard." Which implies a greater caution than St. Augustine would ever have given concerning a book he believed truly canonical. But, saith Bellarmine,|| "his meaning is only to keep men from imitating the example of Razias;" whereas that which they pressed St. Augustine with, was not merely the fact, but the character that is given of it. "*Sanctarum Scripturarum auctoritate laudatus*

* Bellar. de Purgat. l. 1. c. 8.

† P. 55.

‡ Can. l. 2. c. 10. ad 4. [arg. 4.] [p. 60. Colon. Agr. 1605.]

§ Aug. cont. 2nd. Epist. Gaudent. l. 2. c. 23. [l. 1. c. 31. vol. 9. p. 655. Par. 1688.]

|| De Purgat. l. 1. c. 3.

est Razias," are their very words in St. Augustine. And therefore the caution relates to the books, and not merely to his example. And he lessens the character given by the author, when he saith, "he chose to die nobly;" "it had been better," saith he, "to have died humbly." But the other is the eulogium in the heathen histories, and better becomes brave heathens, than true martyrs. Can any one now think St. Augustine believed this writer divinely inspired, or his doctrine sufficient to ground a point of faith upon? And I wonder they should not every jot as well commend self-murder as an heroical act, as prove the doctrine of purgatory from these words of Jason, or his epitomizer. For the argument from the authority of the book, will hold as strongly for one as the other. And yet this is the Achilles for purgatory; which Natalis Alexander* (whom our author follows in this matter) saith, "is a demonstrative place against those that deny it." But I must proceed.

2. "Purgatory is plainly intimated by our Saviour,† Matth. xii. 32, Whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come." By which words, Christ evidently supposes, that some sins are forgiven in the world to come. I am so far from discerning this plain intimation, that I wonder how any came to think of it out of this place. Well! "but doth it not hence follow, that sins may be forgiven in the world to come?" Not near so plainly, as that sins will not be forgiven in the world to come. "Not that particular sin, but others may;" how doth that appear? What intimation is there, that any sins not forgiven here, shall be forgiven there? Or that any sins here remitted as to the eternal punishment, shall be there remitted as to the temporal? And without such a kind of remission, nothing can be inferred from hence. "But if there be a remission in another world, it can be neither in heaven nor hell, therefore it must be in purgatory." But those who own a remission of sins in another world, say it will be on the day of judgment: for the actual deliverance of the just from punishment, may be not improperly called the full remission of their sins. So St. Augustine, whom he quotes, plainly saith, "*Si nulla remitterentur in judicio illo novissimo*," &c. c. Julian, 1. 6. c. 5, where it is evident St. Augustine takes this place to relate to the day of judgment; and so in the other (*De Civit.*

* Natal. Alex. Sec.4. Diss. 4.

† P. 56.

Dei, l. 21. c. 24.) But as he supposed a remission, so he did a purgation as by fire in that day. *In illo judicio poenas quasdam purgatorias futuras.* *De Civit. Dei*, l. 20. c. 25. And so he is to be understood on Psal. 37. to which he applies, 1 Cor. iii. 15. But our author was very much out, when he saith St. Augustine applied 1 Pet. iii. 15; to some place of temporal chastisement in another world, when Bellarmine* sets himself to confute St. Augustine about it, as understanding it of this world. And therefore he hath little cause to boast of St. Augustine's authority about purgatory, unless he had brought something more to the purpose out of him. His other testimonies of antiquity are not worth considering; what he borrows from Natalis Alexander; that of Dionysius Areopag. Eccl. Hierarch. c. 7. is a known counterfeit, and impertinent, relating to a region of rest and happiness. And so do Tertullian's oblations for the dead, *De Cor. Milit.* c. 3. For they were eucharistical, as appears by the ancient Liturgies, being made for the greatest saints. St. Cyprian, ep. 66, speaks of an oblation for the dead; and he there mentions the *natalitia* of the martyrs; but by comparing that with his epist. 33, it will be found that he speaks of the anniversary commemoration of the dead, which signifies nothing to purgatory; for the best men were put into it; and St. Cyprian threatens it as a punishment to be left out of the Diptychs; but surely it is none to escape purgatory. Arnobius, l. 4, only speaks of praying for the dead, which we deny not to have been then used in the Church, not with respect to any temporary pains in purgatory, but to the day of judgment: and therein lies the true state of the controversy, with respect to antiquity; which is not, whether any solemn prayers were not then made for the dead; but whether those prayers did relate to their deliverance out of a state of punishment before the day of judgment: for whatever state souls were then supposed to be in, before the great day, if there could be no deliverance till the day of judgment, it signifies nothing to the present question.

As to the vision of Perpetua concerning her brother Dinocrates, who died at seven years old, being baptized, it is hardly reconcilable to their own doctrine, to suppose such a soul in purgatory; I will not deny that Perpetua did think she saw him in a worse condition; and thought likewise that by her

* Bell. de Antichristo, l. 4. c. 13. [*De Romano Pontifice*, Lib. 3. c. 13. vol. 1. ut supra.]

prayers she brought him into a better ; for she saw him playing like little children ; and then she awaked, and concluded that she had given him ease : but is it indeed come to this, that such a doctrine as purgatory must be built on such a foundation as this ? I do not call in question the acts of Perpetua, nor her sincerity in relating her dream ; but must the Church build her doctrines upon the dreams or visions of young ladies, though very devout ? for Ubia Perpetua was then but twenty-two, as she saith herself. But none are to be blamed, who make use of the best supports their cause will afford.

It is time now to see what strength of reason he offers for purgatory. 1. He saith, "When a sinner is reconciled to God, though the eternal punishment due to his sins is always remitted, yet there sometimes remains a temporal penalty to be undergone ; as in the case of the Israelites, and David." But doth it hence follow, that there is a temporal penalty that must be undergone either here or hereafter, without which there will be no need of purgatory ? Who denies, that God in this life, for example sake, may punish those whose sins he hath promised to remit as to another world ? This is therefore a very slender foundation. 2. "There are some sins of their own nature light and venial." I will not dispute that ; but suppose there be, must men go then into purgatory for mere venial sins ? What a strange doctrine doth this appear to any man's reason ? That God should forgive the greater sins, and require so severe a punishment for sins in their own nature venial ; *i. e.* so inconsiderable in their opinion, that no man is bound to confess them ; which do not interrupt a state of grace ; which require only an implicit detestation of them ;* which do not deserve eternal punishment ; which may be remitted by holy water, or a bishop's blessing, as their divines agree. 3. "That for all sins some penalty is due to the justice of God." And what follows from hence, but the necessity of Christ's satisfaction ? But how doth it appear that after the expiation of sin by Christ, and the remission of eternal punishment, there still remains a necessity of farther satisfaction for such a temporal penalty in another world ? 4. "That generally speaking, few men depart out of this life, but either with the

* S. Th. part. 3. q. 87. art. 3. in cor. v. [vol. 24. p. 484. col. 1. Venet. 1787.] Marsil. Column. Hydragiolog. Sect. 7. [Sect. 2.] c. 3. n. 32. [p. 161. Rom. 1586.] Sect. 3. c. 2. n. 15. 29. [Ibid. p. 281-285.] c. 3. n. 1. Bell. de Cultu Sancti 1. 3. c. 7. Sect. Secundo.

guilt of venial sins, or obnoxious to some temporal punishment." No doubt all men are obnoxious by their sins to the punishment of another world ; but that is not the point, but whether God hath declared, that although he remits the eternal punishment, he will not the temporal ; and although he will forgive thousands of pounds, he will not the pence and farthings we owe to him : but if mortal sins be remitted as to the guilt, and venial do not hinder a state of grace, what room is there for vindictive justice in purgatory ?

Yet this is the doctrine which so much weight is laid upon, that Bellarmine saith, "they must go directly to hell, who do not believe purgatory."* If this be true, why was it not put into the Representation, that we might understand the danger of not believing so credible, so reasonable a doctrine as this ! But we believe it to be a much more dangerous thing to condemn others for not believing a doctrine, which hath so very slender a pretence either to Scripture or reason.

XXIV. *Of Praying in an Unknown Tongue.*

The question in short is, whether the Church Service, at which persons are bound to assist, ought not to be in a language understood by those who are bound to assist ?

For our author grants, "that a Papist is bound to assist at the Church service, and to hear mass;"† but he is not bound to understand the words there spoken.

This is a plain state of the case ; and one would have thought St. Paul's discourse about edification in the Church service, and a known tongue, and the primitive practice, had deserved a little consideration ; but not a word is said to either of them ; and the whole is so managed, as though there had been no rule, or any appearance of practice to the contrary. But I must consider what he doth say.

1. "The mass is a sacrifice." And what then ? have they no other Church-service but the mass ? What then becomes of their breviaries, litanies, and all other offices ? But suppose the priest's office in the mass be to offer the sacrifice ; are there no prayers in the canon of the mass, wherein the people are concerned ? Why must not they understand what they are required to assist in prayer for ? If they have English books, as he saith, to teach them every part and ceremony of

* De Purgatorio, l. 1. c. 11, SS. Hæc sunt. [Vol. 2. ut supra.]

† P. 59.

the mass,* why not as well the prayers in the mass, wherein they are to join? They tell us, "it is unseasonable then for the people to say their beads, and other devotions;" and I suppose, as unseasonable to talk and think of other matters. Why then should not they know what it is they are to do, and what petitions they are then to make to God? Are there no responses to be made? no lessons to be read? no Creed to be professed? Doth not the priest speak to the people to pray, and they answer him? Is there no thanksgiving after the communion which the people are concerned in? We are as much for their devout affections, as they can be; but we think they are not hindered by understanding what they are about.† We cannot but wonder that any man should say, "that it nothing concerns his devotion that the mass is in Latin,"‡ if he understand it not. Is it no part of devotion to join in the public prayers, not merely by rote, but from a due apprehension of the matter contained in them? He requires, "that they accompany the priest in prayer and spirit :—" And why not in understanding also? "But the Church hath so ordered it :—" And that is the thing we complain of, as done against St. Paul, against the Primitive Church, against the natural sense of mankind, who think it is fit for them to know what they do, especially in the worship of God. "But it is to preserve unity." Methinks, however, unity in spirit and understanding is better than without it. "There are other good reasons." I know not one good one; and if there were more, he would have produced them. "The greatest part is said in a low voice, that it is not possible he should hear it." And to what purpose should it be spoken louder, if they are not to understand it? But why so low in public? Yet the people might have books, and join if they understood what was said. But why should not the rest be understood, which is spoken as if it were?

2. As to other offices, he saith, "He is taught that he may perform them in a language which he understands not, with great benefit to his soul, and the acceptance of God, if at those occasions he endeavours to raise his thoughts to heaven, and fix his heart upon his Maker."§ But the question is not, whether a man may not have devout thoughts at that time, but whether he can perform his part in the public offices with true

* P. 61.

† P. 60.

‡ P. 61.

§ P. 64.

devotion, without understanding? For the public offices of devotion were designed for the uniting the hearts and desires of the people in the same things. It is not, whether one man may not pray for heaven, and another for fair weather, and another for pardon of his sins, and a fourth for patience, and so on, in the same place, and at the same time; for all this may be done as well in a silent meeting, where not a word is spoken: but there being one form of prayer for all to join together in that with the united force of the whole congregation, their petitions may go up to heaven; the matter now in dispute is, whether it be not necessary, in order to this united devotion, that the people all know what they pray for? And one would think nothing need to be said to prove this. But what our author adds in justification of this, overthrows all public devotion; for he saith, "it is not necessary to have attention on the words, or on the sense of prayers, but rather purely on God;" which is to make all public forms unnecessary, and to turn all devotion into prayer of contemplation. For if this be true, all forms whatsoever are not only useless, but burdensome; and by the stinting the spirit, do hinder the nimble flights of the soul, in pure silence towards God: and this principle must lead men to enthusiasms, and unintelligible unions, and make them despise forms as a mean and dull dispensation.

But at last he saith, "A petitioner may accompany his petition with an earnest desire of obtaining it, though the language in which it is written, be unknown to him." Very true, if he indited the matter of the petition, and trusted another to put it into that language, which the person to whom he makes it, doth understand, but not his own. But all languages are alike to God's infinite wisdom, and so there can be no pretence on that account, to keep only to some particular tongues, though unknown to the party; and if it were so to all men, no man would have a petition presented in a language which he did not know. But in prayer to God, the design of it is not to acquaint him with something which he knew not, but to excite the hearts and affections of men to an earnest desire of the things which are fit for them to ask. Now let any man undertake to prove, that men's affections are as easily moved by words they do not understand, as by those they do; and I will give up this cause.

XXV. *Of the Second Commandment.*

The dispute about this is not,

Whether the second commandment may be found in any of their books, but by what authority it comes to be left out in any; as he confesses it is in their short Catechisms and Manuals;* but not only in these; for I have now before me the reformed Office of the blessed Virgin, printed at Salamanca, A.D. 1588, published by order of Pius V. where it is so left out. And so in the English office, at Antwerp, A.D. 1658. I wish he had told us in what public office of their Church it is to be found: but himself pleads for the leaving it out, when he saith, "the people are in no danger of superstition or idolatry by it, since the first commandment secures them from it; and there is nothing in this but what is virtually contained in the first, and is rather an explanation than a new and distinct precept."† But is this so plain and clear, that a man's conscience can never make any just and reasonable doubt concerning it? There is a terrible sanction after it; and men had need go upon very good grounds in a matter of such moment. Hath God himself any where declared this to be only an explication of the first commandment? Have the prophets, or Christ and his Apostles ever done it? How then can any man's conscience be safe in this matter? For it is not a trifling controversy, whether it be a distinct commandment, or an explication of the first; but the lawfulness or unlawfulness of the worship of images depends very much upon it; for if it be only an explication of the first, then unless one takes images to be gods, their worship is lawful, and so the heathens were excused in it, who were not such idiots; but if it be a new and distinct precept, then the worshipping any image or similitude becomes a grievous sin, and exposes men to the wrath of God in that severe manner mentioned in the end of it: and it is a great confirmation that this is the true meaning of it, because all the primitive writers of the Christian Church, not only thought it a sin against this commandment, but insisted upon the force of it against those heathens who denied that they took their images for gods; and therefore this is a very insufficient account of leaving out the second commandment.

* P. 63.

† P. 62.

XXVI. *Of Mental Reservations.*

Under this head he denies two things.

1. That they are ever taught to break faith with heretics.
2. That their Church doth allow any equivocations, or mental reservations.

As to the former I am sincerely glad to find a principle so destructive to all human society so utterly disowned, when he saith,* "he is taught to keep faith with all sorts of people, of whatsoever judgment or persuasion they be, and to stand to his word, and observe his promise given, or made to any whatsoever." And whatever opinions and practices there may have been of that kind formerly, we hope there will never be occasion given to revive that dispute.

2. As to the second, we embrace his declaration against it, and hope there is no equivocation or mental reservation in it. But there are some things which must here be taken notice of.

1. He cannot deny that there are authors in communion with his Church which may be charged with teaching another doctrine, and those not a few nor inconsiderable, who not only allow the practice of mental reservations and equivocations, but say with great confidence it hath been received in the Roman Church for no less than four hundred years; and that in some cases they are all still agreed in it. See Parson's Treatise of Mitigation, c. 7. sect. 2, 3. c. 10. sect. 1.

2. We do not deny that Innocent XI. hath condemned equivocations and mental reservations in swearing, as at least scandalous and pernicious in practice; and therefore we cannot charge the Pope with abetting this doctrine. But we cannot but reflect on what our author said about the deposing doctrine, "that although Popes had believed it, and acted by it, yet the greater number opposed it." And what shall we say in this case, if the generality of their casuists in some cases approve it, and think it no lie or perjury, as in that of confession; but if it be really so in any one case, then it may be some other fault, but it is not a lie or perjury in any other, when a man doth not think himself bound to speak all he knows.

3. That as we highly commend the Pope's condemning such doctrines and practices now, so we have reason to think the

* P. 64.

contrary did not once want the encouragement and approbation of the Roman See. As may be found in the resolution of some cases by Pius V. relating to some missionaries who were to be sent hither; and then it was declared, "that if they were summoned before our judges, they might *sophistice jurare et sophistice respondere*,"* and that they were not bound to answer according to the intention of the judges, but according to some true sense of their own, *i. e.* which was made true by the help of a mental reservation. But it is very well, that now the very same things are condemned at Rome, as scandalous and pernicious in practice.

XXVII. Of a Death-bed Repentance.

We have no difference with them about this matter, as far as they hold to these points: 1. That men are strictly obliged to work out their salvation with fear and trembling in time of health.† 2. That it is very dangerous to defer their repentance to the last. 3. That if any are surprised, they ought in charity to have all possible assistance, to put them into the best way for their salvation.

But yet there may be some particular doctrines owned in the Church of Rome which may give men too much encouragement to put off true repentance; as, 1. The easiness of being put into a state of grace by the sacrament of penance; for which no more is required than removing the impediment, as appears by the Council of Trent, sess. 7, can. 6, and afterwards it defines, that bare attrition doth sufficiently dispose a man to receive grace in that sacrament, sess. 14, c. 4. So, that although a man hath led a very bad life, if he hath but this attrition for his sins when he doth confess them, he is put into a state of grace by this sacrament. And what can any man expect more, and what can he do less! I do not mean a bare natural attrition, the sufficiency whereof is condemned by Innocent XI. in the same proposition, fifty-seventh; but that which the Council of Trent calls imperfect contrition, *i. e.* a good motion in a man's mind to forsake his sins for fear of punishment; if really no more be required for a state of grace but this, it is no wonder if men put off the doing of that which may be done at any time so easily by the help of a priest.

2. The treasure of the Church is another thing which is

* Apud. G. Abbot de Mendacio, &c. in Præf. p. 6, &c.

† P. 67, 68.

very apt to hinder men's speedy repentance ; for by that they believe there is a stock ready of so many merits and satisfactions of others, if duly applied to them by indulgences, that they need not be at such pains to work out their own salvation with fear and trembling. When a man by the sacrament of penance is put into a state of grace, the eternal punishment is discharged, and nothing remains but some temporal pains ; and to ease him of these he hath many helps, but especially the treasure of the Church, which the Pope hath the dispensing of, as he is bound to believe ; and by indulgences he may easily get off some thousands of years of purgatory-pains ; and if these should fail him, there is another help yet left, which is, leaving a stock for prayers for his soul when he dies ; which, even our author assures him, are very available towards his speedier release out of purgatory, p. 58.

XXVIII. *Of Fasting.*

The question here is, whether a man doth not observe their Church's command about fasting, who forbears all forbidden things, but takes liberty in those which are not forbidden ?

It is not, whether they may not break the commands of God against gluttony and drunkenness, but whether they break the law of the Church about fasting ; and notwithstanding what our author hath said, I see no reason for the affirmative. I do not deny, 1. That it is a very indifferent sort of fasting,* "to abstain from flesh, unless all sorts of excesses at the same time be carefully avoided." 2. "That excesses on such days are more scandalous, because there is a pretence of fasting." 3. "That God's command doth at all times forbid intemperance."† Which are the chief things he insists upon. But yet this doth not reach the point, which is about their Church's command. For their casuists distinguish fasting into, 1. Natural ; which is total abstinence ; and this is required only in order to receiving the Eucharist. 2. Moral ; which is the same with temperance, or fasting for health. 3. Ecclesiastical ; which is defined by them to be, "an abstinence from food forbidden by the Church." And if this definition be true, it cannot be broken but by eating what the Church hath prohibited.

And therefore their casuists, as far as I can find, are agreed in these things.

* P. 69.

† P. 71.

1. That a man may eat a full meal of what is not forbidden, and not break the Church's precept of fasting, provided vespers be first said. And the latter casuists blame Covarruvias for making any scruple about it. "If a man's excess comes to be a mortal sin, yet for all that," saith Reginaldus,* "he shall not be judged as a breaker of his fast." Nay, Lessius† goes further, and saith, "He doth not lose the merit of fasting." "*Quamvis aliquis multum excedet, non solvit jejunium*,"‡ saith Card. Tolet. And Paulus Zacchias saith, § "This is the common opinion;" and he thinks the intention of the Church is sufficiently answered. And so doth Pasqualigus || in his Praxis of Fasting.

2. A man may drink wine or other drink, as often as he pleaseth, without breaking his fast; "He may *toties quoties bibere*," saith Diana.¶ Zach. Pasqualigus,** who hath written most fully on this subject, shews, "that it is the general opinion, that no quantity of wine or other drink, though taken without any necessity, is a violation of the precept of fasting; no, not although the wine be taken for nourishment, because the Church doth not forbid it; but this last," he saith, "is not the general, but the more probable opinion."

3. A man may eat something when he drinks, to prevent its doing him hurt; besides his good meal, he may take what quantity he pleases of sweetmeats or fruit; he may have a good refection at night, and yet not break this strict precept of fasting. "For the eating as often as one drinks, it is the common opinion," saith the same casuist (who was no Jesuit),†† "that it is not forbidden, because it is taken by way of a medicine;" and he quotes a great number of their casuists for it. "A collation at evening is allowed,"‡‡ saith he. And Lessius§§ saith, "There is no certain rule for the quantity of it." And Card. Tolet||| saith, "very large ones are allowed at Rome by the Pope's connivance;" "even in the court of

* Reginald. Praxis, l. 4. c. 14. n. 163.

† Less. de Justit. l. 4. c. 2. Dub. 2. n. 10.

‡ Instruct. Sacerd. l. 6. c. 2. n. 4. [p. 633. col. 1. Colon. 1621.]

§ P. Zacch. Qu. Medico. legales l. 5. tit. 1. Qu. 1. p. 29, 30, 31.

|| Pasqual Decis. 120. n. 5.

¶ Dian. Sum. v. Jejun. n. 7.

** Zach. Pasqualigi. Praxis. jejunii Eccles. Decis. 116. n. 3. Dec. 117.

1, 2, 3.

†† Decis. 119. n. 2.

‡‡ Decis. 86. n. 3, 4.

§§ Lessius, ubi supra.

||| Tolet. ubi sup.

Rome," saith Reginaldus.* And now I leave the reader to judge of the severity of fasting required in the Church of Rome.

XXIX. *Of Divisions and Schisms in the Church.*

Two things he saith upon this head.

1. That they are all agreed in matters of faith.
2. That they only differ in some school points; from whence he infers, that they have no schisms or separations among them.

But that this is no just consequence, will appear by the schisms and separations among us, made by such who profess to agree in all matters of faith. Yet let us see how he proves that they agree in all matters of faith; "because they agree to submit equally to the determinations of the Church."[†]

Now this very way evidently proves that they do not all agree, because they do not equally submit to the Church's determinations. For,

1. Some say they are bound to submit to the Church's determinations, as it represents the universal Church: others say, no; but as the Church's power is virtually lodged in the guides of it. Now this is a very material difference: for if it be on the former account, then not the Popes and Councils' declarations are to be regarded, but as they express the sense of the universal Church; and so the majority of votes, and numbers in the representative and diffusive Church is chiefly to be regarded. And on this ground some reject the deposing power, though plainly decreed by Popes and Councils; but they un hinge their Church's authority by it: now how is it possible for them to agree about matters of faith, who differ fundamentally about the way how any things com (to be matters of faith? If they be decreed by Popes and Councils, say some; and so the deposing power is become an article of faith. No such matter, say others, for a greater number in the diffusive Church oppose it, as in the Gallican Church, and elsewhere. Very well! But how then can these parties be said to agree in matters of faith, and an equal submission to the determinations of the Church?

2. Some again say, that it is not the consent of the present Church can make any article of faith, but there must be an universal tradition from the Apostles' times. And so they tell us the deposing power can never be an article of faith, because

* Regin. ubi sup. n. 185.

† P. 72.

it wants the consent of all the ages before Gregory VII. So that upon this ground there can be no article of faith which cannot be proved to be thus delivered down to us. Others again say, this is in effect to give up their cause, knowing the impossibility of proving particular points in this manner; and therefore, they say, the present Church is wholly to be trusted for the sense of the foregoing.

Now these differences are still on foot in their Church; and from these do arise daily disputes about matters of faith, and the seat of infallibility, whether in the guides, or the body of the Church; if the former, whether in the Church representative, or virtual? whether the personal infallibility of the Pope be a matter of faith or not? Our author saith, not; others say, yes; and yet he saith they are agreed in matters of faith. So that by his own confession they differ about other things than mere school points.

But suppose they were agreed in articles of faith, can there be no schisms or divisions in their Church? What thinks he of all the schisms between Popes and Popes; of all the schisms between the Popes and the Emperor's parties? Which were as notorious, and scandalous, and mischievous, as ever were in the world. What thinks he of the schism between the bishops and the regular orders, which were as cross and peevish towards the bishops and secular clergy, as our dissenters themselves? And among the regular orders, what heats and contentions have been, not about the practice of a devout life, I assure him, but about matters of doctrine; and which both parties severally plead to be matters of faith? As in the noted controversies of this last age, about the immaculate conception of the blessed Virgin, the power of grace, and the Pope's personal infallibility; and they cannot say they are as yet agreed about these things.

XXX. *Of Friars and Nuns.*

Our dispute is not, about the lawfulness of retiring from the world by such persons who are rendered unfit for doing service in it; and the more they spend their time in devotion and contemplation, so much the better.

But it lies in these things.

1. Whether the perfection of a Christian state of life lies in being cloistered up from the world, or labouring to do good in it? For this was the great snare made use of, to draw men into it, because they represented this as a most perfect state;

whereas according to the doctrine and example of Christ and his Apostles, the active life of doing good is far beyond it.

2. Whether, although such a retirement be allowed, it be a thing pleasing to God, to tie such persons up by indispensable vows, whatever their circumstances may be, not to alter that state of life; who either in youth, or through force, passion, or discontent, have entered into it; and this may be so much rather questioned, because those who assert the Pope may dispense, go upon this ground, because circumstances may alter the obligation of a vow; and when a greater good is to be attained, it ceaseth to oblige; which to my apprehension doth not prove the Pope's power to dispense, but the dispensable nature of the vows themselves.

1. Whether all things of this nature being liable, in continuance of time, to great degeneracy and corruptions; and the numbers of such places being unserviceable either to Church or state, it be not in the power of the king and states of the kingdom, to dissolve and reduce them to ways more suitable to the conveniences of both?

As to what he discourses about "counsels of perfection, the distractions of the world, the corruptions of the best things," &c., they reach not the main points, but are only general topics, which we are not concerned to debate.

XXXI. *Of wicked Principles and Practices.*

The Misrepresenter charges the Church of Rome with many horrid practices, as the French and Irish massacres, the murders of two kings of France, the holy league, the gunpowder treason, &c. And charges these as being done according to the principles of that Church.

But in answer to this he saith, 1. In general, "that the doctrine of it is holy, teaching the love of God, and our neighbour; and that none can be saved by faith alone."* In which doctrine we heartily concur with them. 2. "That although many uncertain things pass for certain, and false for true, yet he cannot deny that all ranks and degrees of men have been corrupted among them, being scandalous in their lives, wicked in their designs, without the fear of God in their hearts, or care of their own salvation."† This is a general acknowledgment, but no particular answer to the things objected. 3. "That the whole Church is not to be charged for the sake of such villanies."‡ Very true, unless some doctrine owned in that

* P. 77.

† P. 79.

‡ P. 81.

Church gave encouragement to them : as suppose any should ever have fallen into rebellion upon the belief of the deposing power ; is not that doctrine chargeable with the consequences of it ? They are extremely to blame who charge a Church with what her members do in direct opposition to her doctrine ; but it is quite another case, when the main ground they allege for their actions is some allowed principle in it. 4. " They are not accountable for the actions of every bishop, cardinal, or Pope ; for they extend not their faith beyond the declaration of General Councils."* But suppose General Councils have declared such doctrines and Popes act but according to them ; is not their Church then accountable for their actions ? 5. " There is more praying and fasting, and receiving the sacraments, more visiting the prisoners, and the sick, more almsgiving in any of our neighbouring Popish towns, as Paris, Antwerp, Ghent, &c. than in any ten towns of the Reformation."† And is there more charity too ? It doth not appear, if they be as ready to censure others, and admire themselves, as our author who so freely gives his judgment about a matter it is impossible for him to know.

We see no reason to admire or imitate the manner of their praying, and fasting, and receiving the sacraments ; for to pray without understanding, to fast without abstinence, to receive a maimed sacrament, are things we do not envy them for ; but although our devotion be not so pompous and full of show, yet we may pray and fast in secret, according to our Saviour's directions, far more than they do ; however our people are mightily to blame if they do not understand what they pray for, if they do not receive more of the sacrament than they ; and we verily believe there are as great and remarkable instances of true charity among those of the Church of England, as among any people in the world.

XXXII. *Of Miracles.*

1. Our author saith, " He is not obliged to believe any one miracle besides what is in Scripture."‡

2. " He sees no reason to doubt the truth of many miracles, which are attested by great numbers of eye-witnesses, examined by authority, and found upon record with all the formalities due to such a process."

Now, how can these two things stand together ? Is not a man obliged to believe a thing so well proved ? And if his

* P. 82.

† P. 83.

‡ P. 83.

other arguments prove any thing, it is, that he is bound to believe them. For he thinks there is as much reason to believe miracles still, as in the time of the Old or New Law. If he can make this out, I see no reason why he should not be obliged to believe them now, as well as those recorded in Scripture. But I can see nothing like a proof of this. And all persons of judgment in their own Church do grant there is a great difference between the necessity of miracles for the first establishing a religion, and afterwards. This is not only asserted by Tostatus, Erasmus, Stella, Andradius, and several others formerly; but the very late French author I have several times mentioned, saith it in express terms.* And he confesses the great impostures of modern miracles, which, he saith, ought to be severely punished; and that none but women and weak people think themselves bound to believe them. And he cannot understand what they are good for: not to convert heretics; because not done among them: not to prove there are no corruptions or errors among them, which is a thing incredible; with much more to that purpose; and so concludes with Monsieur Paschal, "that if they have no other use, we ought not to be amused with them."

"But Christ promised, that his Apostles should do greater miracles than himself had done." And what then? Must therefore St. Francis, or St. Dominic, or St. Rosa, do as great as the Apostles had done? What consequence can be drawn from the Apostles' times to later ages? We do not dispute God's omnipotency, or say his hand is shortened; but we must not from thence infer that every thing which is called a miracle is truly so, or make use of God's power to justify the most incredible stories; which is a way will serve as well for a false as a true religion, and Mahomet might run to God's omnipotency for cleaving the moon in two pieces, as well as others for removing a house over the seas, or anything of a like nature.

But, he saith, "their miracles are not more ridiculous and absurd than some of the Old Testament," which I utterly deny: but I shall not run out into the examination of this parallel, by shewing how very different the nature, design and authority of the miracles he mentions, is from those which are believed in the Roman Church. And it had been but fitting, as he set down the miracles of the Old Testament, so to have

* *Moyens Surs et Honestes*, &c. to. 2. p. 149.

mentioned those of the Roman Church which were to vie with them ; but this he was willing to forbear, for certain good reasons. " If most of poor man's impossibles be none to God," as he concludes, " yet every thing is not presently true which is not impossible ;" and by this way of arguing there can be nothing objected against the most absurd and idle fictions of the Golden Legend, which all men of understanding among themselves not only reject for want of authority, but of credibility.

XXXIII. *Of Holy Water.*

The Misrepresenter charges him with approving superstitious uses of inanimate things, and attributing wonderful effects to them ; as holy water, candles, oil, bread, &c.

In answer, our author, 1. declares,* " that the Papist, truly represented, utterly disapproves all sorts of superstition." But if he had designed to have represented truly, he ought to have told us what he meant by superstition, and whether any man who observes the commands of the Church can be guilty of it.

2. He saith, " that these things are particularly deputed by the prayers and blessing of the priest, to certain uses for God's glory, and the spiritual and corporal good of Christians."

This is somewhat too general ; but Marsilius Columna,† archbishop of Salerno, who hath taken most pains in this matter, sums them up : 1. As to spiritual, they are seven. 1. To fright devils. 2. To remit venial sins. 3. To cure distractions. 4. To elevate the mind. 5. To dispose it for devotion. 6. To obtain grace. 7. To prepare for the sacrament.

2. As to corporal. 1. To cure barrenness. 2. To multiply goods. 3. To procure health. 4. To purge the air from pestilential vapours.

And now, as our author saith, " what superstition in the use of holy water ?" He names several things of God's own appointing to parallel it ; as the waters of jealousy, the shewbread, the tables of stone ; but the first was miraculous, the other had no such effects that we ever heard of. Elisha's salt for sweetening the water was undoubtedly a miracle. Is the holy water so ? As to the liver of the fish for expelling the devil, in the Book of Tobit, he knows the book is not owned for canonical by us ; and this very place is produced as an

* P. 86.

† Hydragiolog. sect. 3. c. 2, 12. p. 45.

argument against it ; there being no ground from Scripture to attribute the power of expelling devils to the liver of a fish, either naturally or symbolically. Vallesius * offers at the only probable account of it, that it must be a divine power given to it which the angel Raphael did not discover ; and yet it is somewhat hard to conceive, how this liver should have such a power to drive away any kind of devil, as it is there expressed, unless by a devil there, no more be meant than some violent disease, which the Jews generally believed to arise from the possession of evil spirits : but, however, here is an angel supposed, who made this known to Tobit ; but we find not a Raphael to discover the virtue of holy water against devils. As to Christ's using clay to open the eyes of the blind, it is very improperly applied, unless the same miraculous power be supposed in it which was in Christ himself : and so is the Apostles' laying on of hands, and using oil for miraculous cures ; unless the same gift of miracles be in every priest who consecrates holy water, which was in the Apostles : and Bellarmine himself confesses, "that no infallible effect doth follow the use of holy water, because there is no promise of God in the case, but only the prayers of the Church."† "But these are sufficient to sanctify the water," saith our author : and to what end ? For all the spiritual and corporal benefits before-mentioned ? Is no promise of God necessary for such purposes as those ? How can any Church in the world dispose of God's power without his will ? It may appoint significant and decent ceremonies, but it can never appropriate divine effects to them : and to suppose any divine power in things which God never gave them, is, in my opinion, superstition ; and to use them for such ends is a superstitious use. St. Cyril, whom he quotes, speaks of the consecration of the water of baptism, Catech. 3. St. Augustine only of a consecrated bread, which the catechumens had (*De Peccat. Merit. et Remiss.* l. 2, c. 26), but he attributes no divine effects to it. Pope Alexander's Epistle is a notorious counterfeit. Those passages of Epiphanius, Theodoret, and St. Jerome, all speak of miraculous effects ; and those who had the power of miracles might sometimes do them with an external sign, and sometimes without, as the Apostles cured with anointing and without : but this is no ground for consecrating oil by the Church, or holy water for miraculous effects. If these effects which they attribute to holy water be miraculous,

* Valles. *Sacr. Philosoph.* c. 28. p. 229.

† *De Cultu Sancti.* l. 3. c. 7.

then every priest must have not only a power of miracles himself, but of annexing it to the water he consecrates; if they be supernatural but not miraculous, then holy water must be made a sacrament to produce these effects *ex opere operato*; if neither one nor the other, I know not how to excuse the use of it from superstition.

XXXIV. *Of breeding up People in Ignorance.*

The Misrepresenter charges them with this, on these accounts. 1. By keeping their mysteries of iniquity from them. 2. By performing divine service in an unknown tongue. 3. By an implicit faith. To which the Representer answers, 1. "That they give encouragement to learning;"* and he instances in their universities and conventual libraries; but what is all this to the common people? But their *Indices expurgatorii*, and prohibiting books so severely, which are not for their turn (as we have lately seen in the new one of Paris), argues no great confidence of their cause, nor any hearty love to learning: and if it could be rooted out of the world, their Church would fare the better in it; but if it cannot, they must have some to be able to deal with others in it. 2. As to the common people he saith, "they have books enough to instruct them."† Is it so in Spain or Italy? But where they live among heretics, as we are called, the people must be a little better instructed to defend themselves, and to gain upon others. 3. "If the people did know their church offices and service, &c. they would not find such fault, since the learned approve them." Let them then try the experiment, and put the Bible and their Church offices every where in the vulgar tongues: but their severe prohibitions shew how much they are of another opinion. What made all that rage in France against Voisin's translation of the Missal? such proceedings of the assembly of the clergy against it; such complaints both to the King and the Pope against it, as though all were lost if that were suffered? such an edict from the King, such a prohibition from the Pope in such a tragical style about it? such a collection of authors to be printed on purpose against it?‡ Do these things shew, even in a nation of so free a temper, in comparison, as the French, any mighty inclination towards the encouraging this knowledge in the people? And since that, what

* P. 89.

† P. 90.

‡ *Collectio Authorum Vulg. Versionem damnantium Jussu ac Mandato Cleri Gallicani edita. Lutet. Paris. 1661.*

stirs have there been about the *Mons Testament*? what prohibitions by bishops? what vehement opposition by others? so that many volumes have already been written on the occasion of that translation. And yet our author would persuade us, that if we look abroad we shall find wonderful care taken to keep the people from ignorance; but we can discern much greater to keep them in it.

XXXV. *Of the Uncharitableness of the Papists.*

The Misrepresenter (as he is called), charges this point home, "Because they deny salvation to those who believe all the articles of the Christian faith in the Apostles' Creed, and lead virtuous and good lives, if they be not of their own communion."

To this the Representer answers in plain terms,* "That this is nothing but what they have learnt from the mouth of Christ and his Apostles." And to this end he musters up all their sayings against infidels, false apostles, Gnostics, Cerinthians, as though they were point-blank levelled against all that live out of the communion of the Church of Rome."

But "this is no uncharitableness, but pure zeal, and the same the Primitive Church shewed against heretics, such as Marcion, Basilides, and Bardesanes, who were condemned in the first age for denying the resurrection of the dead," &c.† What, in the first age! Methinks the second had been early enough for them: but this is to let us see what learning there is among you. But do we deny the resurrection of the dead? or hold any one of the heresies condemned by the Primitive Church? What then is our fault, which can merit so severe a sentence? "We oppose the Church." What Church? The Primitive Apostolical Church? the Church in the time of the four General Councils? I do not think that will be said, but I am sure it can never be proved. What Church then? "The present Church?" Is it then damnable to oppose the present Church? But I pray let us know what ye mean by it? "The universal body of Christians in the world?" No, no, abundance of them are heretics and schismatics as well as we: *i. e.* all the Christians in the eastern and southern parts, who are not in communion with the Church of Rome: so that two parts in three of Christians are sent to hell by this principle; and yet it is no uncharitableness. But suppose the Church of

* P. 92.

† P. 95.

Rome be the only true Church, must men be damned presently for opposing its doctrines? I pray think a little better on it, and you will change your minds. Suppose a man do not submit to the guides of this Church in a matter of doctrine declared by them; must he be damned? What if it be the deposing power? Yet his principle is, "if a man do not hold the faith entire, he is gone."* But Popes and Councils have declared this to be a point of faith; therefore if he doth not hold it, he must be damned. There is no way of answering this, but he must abate the severity of his sentence against us. For upon the same reason he questions that, we may question many more. And all his arguments against us will hold against himself; for, saith he, "he that disbelieves one article of Catholic faith, does in a manner disbelieve all."† Let him therefore look to it, as well as we. But he endeavours to prove "the Roman Catholic Church to be the true Church, by the ordinary notes and marks of the Church."‡ Although he is far enough from doing it; yet this will not do his business. For he must prove, that we are convinced that it is the true Church; and then indeed he may charge us with obstinate opposition, but not before. And it is a very strange thing to me, that when their divines say, that infidels shall not be damned for their infidelity, where the Gospel hath not been sufficiently proposed to them; and no Christian for not believing any article of faith till it be so proposed; that we must be damned for not believing the articles of the Roman faith, which never have been, and never can be sufficiently proposed to us. Methinks such men should study a little better their own doctrine, about the sufficient proposal of matters of faith, before they pass such uncharitable and unlearned censures.

XXXVI. *Of Ceremonies and Ordinances.*

His discourse on this head is against those who refuse to obey their superiors in things not expressed in Scripture, which is no part of our controversy with them. But yet there are several things about their ceremonies we are not satisfied in: as, 1. The mighty number of them; which have so much muffled up the sacraments, that their true face cannot be discerned. 2. The efficacy attributed to them, without any promise from God; whereas we own no more but decency and

* P. 96.

† P. 97.

‡ P. 98.

Apollonary. 2. The doctrine that goes along with that of *only of doctrine*, but of *fact*; and some have asserted *Opus Operationis et executionis* as well as *veritatis*, which power of the laity goes along with them; viz. whether it was some act of the Church committed about the matter there; as in the consecration of oil, salt, bread, and water, &c.

XXXIII. Of Innovation in Matters of Faith.

The substance of this discourse on this head may be reduced to three things. 1. "That the Church is ever ago, hath got to declare what is necessary to be believed with authority those who oppose the contrary; and as the Council of Trent in declaring transubstantiation, purgatory, &c. so in various articles, did no more than the Church hath done before on like occasions." 2. That if the doctrine then defined had not innovations, they must have met with great opposition when they were introduced.† 3. That those who changed the points to be innovated, might as well have laid the council's any other article of faith which they retained."‡

These are things necessary to be examined, in order to its making good the charge of innovation in matters of faith which we believe doth stand on very good grounds.

1. We are to consider, whether the Council of Trent had equal reason to declare the necessity of these points, as the Council of Nice and Constantinople had to determine the point of the Trinity; or those of Ephesus and Chalcedon, the truth of Christ's incarnation §. He doth not assert it to be in the Church's power to make new articles of faith, as they do imply new doctrines revealed; but he contends earnestly, that the Church hath a power to declare the necessity of believing some points which were not so declared before. And if the necessity of believing doth depend upon the Church's declaration, then he must assert, that it is in the Church's power to make points necessary to be believed which were not so; and consequently to make common opinions to become articles of faith. But I hope we may have leave to inquire in this case, since the Church pretends to no new revelation of matters of doctrine, therefore it can declare no more than it receives, and no otherwise than it receives. And so nothing can be made necessary in salvation but what God himself hath made so by his reve-

* E 108, 109.

† P. 112, &c.

‡ P. 116.

§ P. 109.

lation. So that they must go in their declaration either upon Scripture, or universal tradition; but if they define any doctrine to be necessary without these grounds, they exceed their commission, and there is no reason to submit to their decrees, or to believe their declarations. To make this more plain by a known instance: it is most certain that several Popes and Councils have declared the deposing doctrine, and yet our author saith, "it is no article of faith with him." Why not, since the Popes and Councils have as evidently delivered it, as the Council of Trent hath done purgatory or transubstantiation? But he may say, "there is no anathema joined to it." Suppose there be not; but why may it not be, as well as in the other cases? And if it were, I would know, whether in his conscience he would then believe it to be a necessary article of faith, though he believed that it wanted Scripture and tradition? If not, then he sees what this matter is brought to, *viz.* that although the Council of Trent declare these new doctrines to be necessary to be believed; yet if their declaration be not built on Scripture and universal tradition, we are not bound to receive it.

2. "As to the impossibility of innovations coming in without notorious opposition," I see no ground at all for it, where the alteration is not made at once, but proceeds gradually. He may as well prove it impossible for a man to fall into a drowsy or a hectic fever, unless he can tell the punctual time when it began. And he may as well argue thus, such a man fell into a fever upon a great debauch, and the physicians were presently sent for to advise about him; therefore the other man hath no chronical distemper, because he had no physicians when he was first sick; as because Councils were called against some heresies, and great opposition made to them, therefore where there is not the like, there can be no innovation. But I see no reason why we should decline giving an account, by what degrees, and steps, and upon what occasions, and with what opposition several of the doctrines defined at Trent were brought in. For the matter is not so obscure as you would make it, as to most of the points in difference between us. But that is too large a task to be here undertaken.

3. There is no colour for calling in question the articles of faith received by us on the same grounds that we reject those defined by the Council of Trent; for we have the universal consent of the Christian world for the Apostles' Creed; and of the four General Councils for the doctrines of the Trinity and incarna-

tion ; who never pretended to determine any point to be necessary which was not revealed in Scripture ; whose sense was delivered down by the testimony of the Christian Church from the Apostles' times. But the Council of Trent proceeded by a very different rule ; for it first set up an unwritten word to be a rule of faith, as well as the written ;* which although it were necessary in order to their decrees, was one of the greatest innovations in the world ; and the foundation of all the rest, as they were there established.

AN ANSWER TO THE CONCLUSION.

HAVING thus gone through the several heads, which our author complains have been so much misrepresented ; it is now fit to consider what he saith in his Conclusion, which he makes, to answer his introduction, by renewing therein his doleful complaints of their being "misrepresented just as Christ and his Apostles, and the primitive Christians were."† I hope the former discourse hath shewed their doctrines and practices are not so very like those of Christ and his Apostles, and the primitive Christians, that their cases should be made so parallel : but as in his conclusion he hath summed up the substance of his representations, so I shall therein follow his method, only with this difference, that I shall in one column set down his own representations of Popery, and in the other the reasons, in short, why we cannot embrace them.

Wherein Popery consists as represented by this author. *Our Reasons against it in the several particulars.*

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>1. In using all external acts of adoration before images, as kneeling, praying, lifting up the eyes, burning candles, incense, &c. Not merely to worship the objects before them, but to worship the images themselves on the account of the ob-</p> | <p>1. "Thou shalt not make to thyself any graven image, or any likeness of any thing in heaven, or earth, &c. thou shalt not bow down to them, nor worship them." Which being the plain, clear, and express words of the divine law, we dare not worship any images or representations, lest we be found transgressors of this law. Especially since God herein hath declared himself a jealous God ; and annexed so</p> |
|---|--|

* Sess. Quarta. [Labbe, Concil. vol. 14. p. 746. Lut. Par. 1671.]

† P. 119.

Popery as Represented.

jects represented by them; or in his own words, "Because the honour that is exhibited to them, is referred to the prototypes which they represent," p. 3.

2. "In joining the saints in heaven together with Christ in intercession for us, and making prayers on earth to them on that account," p. 5.

3. "In allowing more supplications to be used to the blessed Virgin than to Christ;" for he denies it to be an idle superstition, to repeat ten Ave Marias for one Pater Noster.

Our Reasons against it.

severe a sanction to it. And since he that made the law is only to interpret it, all the distinctions in the world can never satisfy a man's conscience, unless it appear that God himself did either make or approve them. And if God allow the worship of the thing represented by the representation, he would never have forbidden that worship absolutely, which is unlawful only in a certain respect.

2. "We have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous," 1 John ii. 1. "And but one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus," 1 Tim. ii. 5. "For Christ is entered into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us," Heb. ix. 24. And therefore we dare not make other intercessors in heaven besides him; and the distance between heaven and us, breaks off all communication between the saints there and us upon earth; so that all addresses to them now for their prayers, are in a way very different from desiring others on earth to pray for us: and if such addresses are made in the solemn offices of divine worship, they join the creatures with the Creator in the acts and signs of worship which are due to God alone.

3. "Call upon me in the day of trouble, I will deliver thee, and thou shalt glorify me," Psal. l. 15. When we pray to our Father in heaven, as our Saviour commanded us, we do but what both natural and Christian religion require us to do: but when men pray to the blessed Virgin "for help and protection now, and at the hour of death," they attribute that to her which

*Popery as Represented.**Our Reasons against it.*

4. "In giving religious honour and respect to relics." Such as placing them upon altars, burning wax-candles before them, carrying them in processions, to be seen, touched, or humbly kissed by the people; which are the known and allowed practices in the Church of Rome, p. 8.

5. "In adoring Christ as present in the eucharist on the account of the substance of bread and wine being changed into that body of Christ which suffered on the cross," p. 10.

6. "In believing the substance of bread and wine, by the words of consecration, to be

belongs only to God, who is our helper and defender: and although Christ knew the dignity of his mother above all others, he never gives the least encouragement to make such addresses to her; and to suppose her to have a share now in the kingdom of Christ in heaven, as a co-partner with him, is to advance a creature to divine honour, and to overthrow the true ground of Christ's exaltation to his kingdom in heaven, which was, his suffering on the cross for us.

4. "And no man knoweth of the sepulchre of Moses unto this day," Deut. xxxiv. 6. Why should God hide the body of Moses from the people, if he allowed "giving religious honour and respect to relics?" Why should "Hezekiah break in pieces the brazen serpent, because the children of Israel did burn incense to it?" 2 Kings xviii. 4. Especially when it was a type or representation of Christ himself, and God had wrought many miracles by it.

5. "Whom the heaven must receive until the times of the restitution of all things," Acts iii. 21. And therefore in the eucharist we adore him as "sitting on the right hand of God;" but we dare not direct our adoration to the consecrated host, which we believe to be the substance of bread and wine (though consecrated to a divine mystery), and therefore not a fit object for our adoration.

6. "The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?" 1 Cor. x. 16. This is spoken of the bread after consecration, and yet

Papery as Represented.

changed into his own body and blood, the species only or accidents of bread and wine remaining as before," p. 10.

7. "In making good works to be truly meritorious of eternal life," p. 13.

8. "In making confession of our sins to a priest in order to absolution," p. 14.

9. "In the use of

Our Reasons against it.

the Apostle supposes it to be bread still, and the communion of his body is interpreted in these words, "For we being many are one bread, and one body; for we are all partakers of that one bread," ver. 17. Which is very different from the bread being changed into the very body of Christ; which is an opinion that hath no foundation in Scripture, and is repugnant to the common principles of reason, which God hath given us, and exposes Christian religion to the reproach and contempt of Jews, Turks, and infidels.

7. "When ye shall have done all those things which are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants: we have done that which was our duty to do," St. Luke xvii. 10. And therefore in no sense can our best works "be truly meritorious of eternal life:" which consisting in the enjoyment of God, it is impossible there should be any just proportion or due commensuration between our best actions and such a reward.

8. "And the son said unto him, Father, I have sinned against heaven, and in thy sight," St. Luke xv. 21.

Where confession to God is required because the offence is against him, but it is impossible for any man upon earth to forgive those whom God doth not forgive: and he alone can appoint the necessary conditions of pardon, among which true contrition and repentance is fully declared; but confession to a priest, though it may be useful for the ease of the penitent, is no where in Scripture made necessary for the forgiveness of sin.

9. "I said, I will confess my trans-

Papery as Represented.

indulgences for taking away the temporal punishments of sin, remaining due after the guilt is remitted."

10. "In supposing that penitent sinners may in some measure satisfy by prayer, fasting, alms, &c. for the temporal pain, which by order of God's justice sometimes remains due, after the guilt and the eternal pain are remitted," p. 71.

Our Reasons against it.

gressions unto the Lord; and thou forgavest the iniquity of my sin," Psalm xxxii. 5.

If God doth fully forgive the guilt of sin, there remains no obligation to punishment; for wherever that is, the guilt remains. It is true, God may not sometimes fully pardon; but he may reserve some temporal punishment here for his own honour, or the chastisement of a penitent sinner; but then what have any men to do, to pretend that they can take off what God thinks fit to lay on? Can any indulgences prevent pain, or sickness, or sudden death? But if indulgences be understood only with respect to canonical penances, they are most notorious and inexcusable corruption of the discipline of the ancient Church.

10. "For if when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son; much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life," Rom. v. 10. And therefore no satisfaction to the justice of God is now required from us, for the expiation of any remainder of guilt. For if Christ's satisfaction were in itself sufficient for a total remission, and was so accepted by God; what account then remains for the sinner to discharge, if he perform the conditions on his part? But we do not take away hereby the duties of mortification, prayer, fasting, and alms, &c., but there is a difference to be made between the acts of Christian duties, and satisfaction to divine justice for the guilt of sin, either in whole or in part. And to think to join any satisfactions of ours, together with Christ's, is like joining our hand with

*Popery as Represented.**Our Reasons against it.*

11. "In thinking the Scripture not fit to be read generally by all, without license, or in the vulgar tongues," p. 19.

God's in creating or governing the world.

11. "Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly in all wisdom; teaching and admonishing one another," &c. Coloss. iii. 16.

How could that dwell richly in them, which was not to be communicated to them, but with great caution? How could they teach and admonish one another in a language not understood by them? The Scriptures of the New Testament were very early perverted; and if this reason were sufficient to keep them out of the hands of the people, certainly they would never have been published for common use but as prudently dispensed then, as some think it necessary they should be now. But we esteem it a part of our duty, not to think ourselves wiser than Christ or his Apostles, nor to deprive them of that invaluable treasure which our Saviour hath left to their use.

12. "In allowing the books of Tobit, Judith, Ecclesiasticus, Wisdom, Maccabees, to be canonical," p. 21.

12 "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God," 2 Tim. iii. 16. "Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost," 2 Pet. i. 21.

Therefore, where there is no evidence of divine inspiration, those books cannot be made canonical. But the Jewish Church, to whom the oracles of God were committed, never delivered these books as any part of them, being written when inspiration was ceased among them. And it is impossible for any Church in the world to make that to be divinely inspired, which was not so from the beginning.

13. "In preferring the vulgar Latin edition of the Bible before any other, and

13. "But I say, have they not heard? Yes, verily: their sound went into all the earth, and their words unto the ends of the world," Rom. x. 18.

Popery as Represented.

not allowing any translation into a mother-tongue to be ordinarily read," p. 24, 26.

14. "In believing that the Scripture alone can be no rule of faith to any private or particular person," p. 28.

15. "In relying upon the authority of the present Church for the sense of Scripture," p. 29.

Our Reasons against it

Therefore the intention of God was, that the Gospel should be understood by all mankind; which it could never be, unless it were translated into their several languages. But still the difference is to be observed, between the originals and translations; and no Church can make a translation equal to the original. But among translations, those deserve the greatest esteem which are done with the greatest fidelity and exactness. On which account our last translation deserves a more particular regard by us; as being far more useful to our people, than the vulgar Latin, or any translation made only from it.

14. "Thy word is a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path," Psalm cxix. 105.

Which it could never be, unless it were sufficient for necessary direction in our way to heaven. But we suppose persons to make use of the best means for understanding it, and to be duly qualified for following its directions: without which, the best rule in the world can never attain its end. And if the Scripture hath all the due properties of a rule of faith, it is inconceivable why it should be denied to be so; unless men find they cannot justify their doctrines and practices by it, and therefore are forced to make tradition equal in authority with it.

15. "Wo unto you, lawyers, for ye have taken away the key of knowledge; ye entered not in yourselves, and them that were entering in, ye hindered," Luke xi. 52.

From whence it follows, that the present guides of the Church may be so far from giving the true sense of Scripture, that they may be the chief means

*Popery as Represented.**Our Reasons against it.*

to hinder men from right understanding it. Which argument is of greater force, because those who plead for the infallibility of the guides of the present Church, do urge the promises made to the Jewish Church at that time; as our author doth from those who sat in the chair of Moses, and from Caiaphas's prophesying.

16. "In receiving and believing the Church's traditions as the doctrine of Christ and his Apostles, and assenting to them with divine faith, just as he doth to the Bible," p. 31, 32.

16. "We have also a more sure word of prophecy; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed," 2 Pet. i. 19.

And yet here the Apostle speaks of something delivered by the testimony of those who were with Christ in the holy mount. From whence we infer, that it was not the design of Christ to leave us to any vocal testimony, but to refer us to the written word, as the most certain foundation of faith. And it is not any person's assuming the title of the Catholic Church to themselves, can give them authority to impose any traditions on the faith of Christians; or require them to be believed equally with the written word. For before any traditions can be assented to with divine faith, the Church's authority must be proved to be divine and infallible, either by a written or unwritten word; but it can be done by neither, without overthrowing the necessity of such an infallibility in order to divine faith; because the testimony on which the Church's infallibility is proved, must be received only in a way of credibility.

17. "In believing that the present guides of the Church being assembled in Councils for preserving the unity of the

17. "Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them," Acts xx. 30.

Which being spoken of the guides of the Christian Church, without limita-

Popery as Represented.

Church, have an infallible assistance in their decrees," p. 38.

18. "In believing the Pope to be the supreme head of the Church under Christ, being successor to St. Peter, to whom he committed the care of his flock," p. 40, 41.

19. "In believing that communion in both kinds is an indifferent thing, and was so held for the first four hundred years after Christ; and that the first precept for receiving under both kinds, was given to the faithful by Pope

Our Reasons against it.

tion of number, a possibility of error is implied in any assembly of them; unless there were some other promises which did assure us, that in all great assemblies the Spirit of God shall always go with the casting voice, or the greater number.

18. "And he gave some apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and pastors and teachers—for the edifying of the body of Christ—till we all come into the unity of the faith," &c. Ephes. iv. 13, 14, 15.

Now here being an account given of the officers Christ appointed in his Church, in order to the unity and edification of it, it had been unfaithfulness in the Apostles to have left out the head of it, in case Christ had appointed any. Because this were of more consequence than all the rest; being declared necessary to salvation to be in subjection to him. But neither this Apostle, nor St. Peter himself, give the least intimation of it, which it is impossible to conceive should have been left out in the Apostolical writings upon so many occasions of mentioning it, if ever Christ had instituted a headship in the Church, and given it to St. Peter and his successors in the See of Rome.

19. "For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till he come," 1 Cor. xi. 26.

The Apostle speaking to all communicants, plainly shews that the institution of Christ was, that all should partake of both kinds, and so to continue to do, as long as his sacrament was to shew forth the death of Christ, *viz.* till his second coming. And there is no

Popery as Represented.

Leo I., and confirmed by Pope Gelasius," p. 51.

20. "In believing that the doctrine of purgatory is founded on Scripture authority and reason," p. 54, &c.

Our Reasons against it.

colour for asserting the Christian Church ever looked on observing Christ's institution in this matter as an indifferent thing; no, not for a thousand years after Christ. Although the practice and the obligation are two things, yet when the practice was so agreeable to the institution, and continued so long in the Church, it is hardly possible for us to prove the sense of the obligation by a better way than by the continuance of the practice. And if some traditions must be thought binding, and far from being indifferent, which want all that evidence which this practice carries along with it, how unreasonable is it in this case to allow the practice, and to deny the obligation?

20. "And whom he justified, them he also glorified," Rom. viii. 30.

But whom God justifies, they have the remission of their sins as to eternal punishment. And if those who are thus justified, must be glorified, what place is there for purgatory? For there is not the least intimation of any other state of punishment that any who are justified must pass through, before they are admitted to glory. We grant they may, notwithstanding, pass through many intermediate trials in this world; but we say, where there is justification, there is no condemnation; but where any part of guilt remains unremitted, there is a condemnation remaining so far as the punishment extends. And so this distinction as to eternal and temporal pains, as it is made the foundation of purgatory, is wholly groundless; and therefore the doctrine built upon it can have no foundation in Scripture or reason.

Papery as Represented.

21. "In believing that to the saying of prayers well and devoutly, it is not necessary to have attention on the words, or on the sense of prayers," p. 62.

22. "In believing that none out of the communion of the Church of Rome can be saved; and that it is no uncharitableness to think so," p. 92.

23. "In believing that the Church of Rome, in all the new Articles defined at Trent, hath made no innovation in matters of faith," p. 107.

Our Reasons against it.

21. "I will pray with the spirit, and I will pray with the understanding also," 1 Cor. xiv. 15.

What need this praying with the understanding, if there were no necessity of attending to the sense of prayers? For then praying with the spirit were all that was required: for that supposes an attention of the mind upon God. And I can hardly believe any man that thinks with understanding, can justify praying without it, especially when there are exhortations and invitations to the people to join in those prayers, as it is plain there are in the Roman offices.

22. "Then Peter opened his mouth, and said, Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons; but in every nation, he that feareth God, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him," Acts x. 34, 35.

Whereby we perceive that God doth not limit the possibility of salvation under the Gospel to communion with the See of Rome; for if St. Peter may be believed, the capacity of salvation depends upon men's fearing God and working righteousness; and it is horrible uncharitableness to exclude those from a possibility of salvation, whom God doth not exclude from it.

23. "That ye should earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered to the saints," Jude ver. 3.

Therefore all necessary doctrines of faith were at first delivered; and whatever articles cannot be proved to have been delivered by the Apostles, can never be made necessary to be believed in order to salvation, which overthrows the additional Creed of Pius IV. after

*Popery as Represented.**Our Reasons against it.*

the Council of Trent, and puts them upon the necessity of proving the universal tradition of those doctrines from Apostolical times : and when they do that, we may think better of them than at present we do ; for as yet we can see neither Scripture, nor reason, nor antiquity for them.

Thus I have represented that kind of Popery which our author (who complains so much of misrepresenting) allows ; and I have, in short, set down how little ground we have to be fond of it ; nay, to speak more plainly, it is that we can never yield to, without betraying the truth, renouncing our senses and reason, wounding our consciences, dishonouring God and his holy word and sacraments, perverting the doctrine of the Gospel as to Christ's satisfaction, intercession, and remission of sins ; depriving the people of the means of salvation which God himself hath appointed, and the Primitive Church observed, and damning those for whom Christ died.

We do now, in the sincerity of our hearts, appeal to God and the world, that we have no design to misrepresent them, or to make their doctrines and practices appear worse than they are : but take them with all the advantages even this author hath set them out with, we dare appeal to the judgments and consciences of any impartial men, whether (the Scripture being allowed on both sides), our doctrines be not far more agreeable thereto than the new Articles of Trent, which are the very life and soul of Popery ? Whether our worship of God be not more suitable to the Divine nature and perfections, and the manifestations of his will, than the worship of images and invocation of fellow-creatures ? Whether the plain doctrine of the necessity of repentance and sincere obedience to the commands of Christ, do not tend more to promote holiness in the world, than the sacrament of penance, as it is delivered and allowed to be practised in the Church of Rome, *i.e.* with the ease and efficacy of absolution, and getting off the remainders by indulgences, satisfactions of others, and prayers for the dead ? Whether it be not more according to the institution of Christ to have the communion in both kinds, and to have prayers and the Scriptures in a language which the people understand ? And lastly, whether there be not more of Christian charity in

believing and hoping the best of those vast bodies of Christians, who live out of the communion of the Church of Rome, in the eastern, southern, western, and northern parts, than to pronounce them all incapable of salvation on that account? And therefore out of regard to God and the holy religion of our blessed Saviour; out of regard to the salvation of our own and others' souls, we cannot but very much prefer the communion of our own Church, before that of the Church of Rome.

But before I conclude all, I must take some notice of his anathemas. And here I am as much unsatisfied, as in any other part of his book, and that for these reasons:

1. Because he hath no manner of authority to make them, suppose they were meant never so sincerely. And if we should ever object them to any others of that Church, they would presently say, What had he to do to make anathemas? It belongs only to the Church and the General Councils to pronounce anathemas, and not to any private person whatsoever. So that if he would have published anathemas with authority, he ought to have printed those of the Council of Trent; *viz.* such as these.

“Cursed is he that doth not allow the worship of images.”

“Cursed is he that saith saints are not to be invoked.”

“Cursed is he that doth not believe transubstantiation, purgatory,” &c.

2. Because he leaves out an anathema in a very material point, *viz.* as to the deposing doctrine. We do freely, and from our hearts anathematize all such doctrines as tend to dissolve the bonds of allegiance to our sovereign, on any pretence whatsoever. Why was this passed over by him, without any kind of anathema? Since he seems to approve the Oxford Censures, p. 48. Why did he not here shew his zeal against all such dangerous doctrines? If the deposing doctrine be falsely charged upon their Church, let us but once see it anathematized by public authority of their Church, and we have done. But instead thereof, we find in a book very lately published with great approbations, by a present professor at Lovain, Fr. D'Enghein, all the censures on the other side censured and despised, and the holding the negative as to the deposing doctrine, is declared by him to be heresy, or next to heresy.* The censure of the Sorbonne against Sanctarellus, he saith, “was only done by a faction; and that of sixty-eight doctors there

* Auctoritas sedis Apostolicæ in Reges, p. 374, 408, ad 430.

were but eighteen present ; and the late censure of the Sorbonne, he saith, "was condemned by the Inquisition at Toledo, Jan. 10, 1683, as erroneous and schismatical;"* and so by the clergy of Hungary, Oct. 24, 1682.

We do not question but there are divines that oppose it ; but we fear there are too many who do not ; and we find they boast of their own numbers, and despise the rest as an inconsiderable party. This we do not misrepresent them in, for their most approved books do shew it.

However, we do not question but there are several worthy and loyal gentlemen of that religion, of different principles and practices : and it is pity such be not distinguished from those who will not renounce a doctrine so dangerous in the consequences of it.

3. Because the anathemas he has set down are not penned so plainly and clearly, as to give any real satisfaction ; but with so much art and sophistry, as if they were intended to beguile weak and unwary readers, who see not into the depth of these things, and therefore may think he hath done great matters in his anathemas, when if they be strictly examined, they come to little or nothing ; as,

1. "Cursed is he that commits idolatry." An unwary reader would think herein he disowned all that he accuses of idolatry ; but he doth not curse any thing as idolatry, but what himself thinks to be so. So again, "Cursed is he (not that gives divine worship to images, but) that prays to images, or relics as gods, or worships them for gods." So that if he doth not take the images themselves for gods, he is safe enough from his own anathema.

2. "Cursed is every goddess worshipper," *i. e.* that believes the blessed Virgin not to be a creature. And so they escape all the force of this anathema. "Cursed is he that honours her, or puts his trust in her more than in God." So that if they honour her and trust in her but just as much as in God, they are safe enough. "Or that believes her to be above her Son : " but no anathema to such as suppose her to be equal to him.

3. "Cursed is he that believes the saints in heaven to be his redeemers, that prays to them as such." What if men pray to them as their spiritual guardians and protectors ? Is not this giving God's honour to them ? Doth this deserve no anathema ?

* P. 549.

4. "Cursed is he that worships any brea^den god, or makes god of the empty elements of bread and wine :'' *viz.* that supposes them to be nothing but bread and wine, and yet supposes them to be gods too. Doth not this look like nonsense? And yet I am afraid our author would think it a severe anathema in this matter, to say, "Cursed is he who believes nonsense and contradictions."

It will be needless to set down more, since I have endeavoured by clear stating the several controversies, to prevent the reader being imposed upon by deceitful anathemas. And yet after all he saith,

"Cursed are we, if in answering and saying Amen to any of these curses, we use any equivocations or mental reservation, or do not assent to them in the common and obvious use of the words."

But there may be no equivocation in the very words, and yet there may be a great one in the intention and design of them. There may be none in saying Amen to the curses so worded; but if he would have prevented all suspicion of equivocation, he ought to have put it thus :

"Cursed are we if we have not fairly and ingenuously expressed the whole meaning of our Church as to the points condemned in these anathemas; or if we have by them designed to deceive the people:" and then I doubt he would not so readily have said Amen.

A VIEW OF THE WHOLE CONTROVERSY

BETWEEN THE

REPRESENTER AND THE ANSWERER.

WITH

AN ANSWER TO THE REPRESENTER'S LAST REPLY, IN WHICH
ARE LAID OPEN SOME OF THE METHODS BY WHICH PRO-
TESTANTS ARE MISREPRESENTED BY PAPISTS.

THE Representor was loth to part with his Answerer without asking him in civility how he did :* now from so civil a person, I may, for ought I know, have the courtesy of a turn or two, for asking : which, if he will allow me, I shall at last desire a word or two with him before we part, and that chiefly in civility to ask him how he does ? I would entreat him to go back with me as far as to a Papist Misrepresented and Represented, that we may see how matters have been carried all along, since that book gave occasion to this controversy. How I shall speed in this request† is hard to say, for it is a favour that his second adversary did not obtain, who fairly led the way, when the walk was not quite so long as it is grown since. But with, or without his company, this is the way I must needs go ; and because I will not do it without giving the Representor a reason, it is this : I hope to satisfy those who will go along with me, that he has but jested all this while ; and (to make his words speak truth for once) has passed over all his adversary's answers with a light touch‡ (most of them with none at all) and the most artificial way of replying, with saying nothing to them, as can possibly be met with.

It was well done of him to tell the reader in the title page of his last reply, that it was a Fourth Vindication of a Papist Misrepresented, &c. for if he had not said so, really men could not have believed it. There were thirty-seven double charac-

* Reply, p. 1, † Answ. to Pap. Prot. &c. p. 125. ‡ Reply, p. 2.

ters of a Papist laid down with solemn order in the first book, to tell the world what he is by us falsely said to be, and what he is truly in himself: and this latter character was fortified with such arguments to justify his faith and practice, as could be had. What now is become of all this? What saith the Fourth Vindication in defence of any one particular complaint, representation, or argument? Why, not a word that I can find, unless it be where he barely asks, what we think of praying to images,* and of some few other things, and of more than he would speak of, which stand charged upon the character of a Papist Misrepresented. He puts these questions shortly and confidently, as if nothing had been yet said to any of them. And his behaviour would almost persuade a man that his double characters were yet to be considered, and his reasons yet to be answered. So one would think indeed by comparing his first and last books together, without observing what has come between them; or, at least, that the cause is dropped by one side, or the other: and let him that thinks so, think so still; for that is the plain truth of the case, which I shall make out by an argument that will do the business to the satisfaction of all men but the Representer; and that is, that he hath dropped it.

This I shall do in the first place, if it be but to try whether he will take notice of it in the beginning of this Answer,† though he would not bestow a word upon it when he found it at the end of another.

And perhaps, now that the length of this controversy, together with the windings and turnings of the Representer, has made it something uneasy to be comprehended; it may not be ungrateful to those that have concerned themselves in it, to have some general prospect of it all at once before them; which I shall make as short and as easy as I can, in going through the several books that have been written in this cause, since the first.

The first Answer to the Representer.

The first book that called him to account, was "The Doctrines and Practices of the Church of Rome truly represented;"‡ in which the learned author, having first made some exceptions against the Representer's way of proceeding in his double cha-

* Reply, p. 11.

† Ans. to Pap. Prot. p. 125.

‡ Answer to the Introduction.

acters, went on to examine his characters point by point. Every question was particularly and exactly stated, and the sense of the Church of Rome about it was shewn, by the decrees of the Trent Council, or their Roman Catechism, or their public offices, and their most approved divines and casuists, as the matter required. This was done very distinctly throughout the whole Answer, where he saw cause to correct the state of the question ; that the reader might see the grounds of every particular charge, that we and our fathers have laid against the Church of Rome. And thus, by the way, all the false colours of the Representer were taken off, where he thought it for his purpose to lay them on too foul on his misrepresenting, or too fair on his representing side.

But this was not all ; for whereas the Representer, not altogether trusting to his arts of representation, thought fit sometimes to urge, never failed to insinuate, arguments in favour of his side of the question ; the Answerer, without omitting any shadow of reason offered by the Representer, took all his argumentations, and every pretence from Scripture, into particular examination : I say, he took them one by one in their place and order, and made it appear, that they were very faulty ; as we at least thought, and as we may think still, for any thing that we have heard to the contrary.

Nay, to give occasion to a more perfect understanding of these matters, he took Popery as represented by the Representer himself in one column, and gave him our reasons against it, in another.

And because, to gain the greater opinion of sincerity, the Representer had with anathemas disclaimed several points, which, as he said, are imputed to Papists by Protestants ; the Answerer considered him here too very particularly, and seemed to discover insincerity in the Representer, even where one would be most apt to believe him to be in good earnest.

To all which I must add, that this was done throughout with that calmness and moderation, that his adversary did not think fit to dissemble it. So that this book wanted nothing to make it deserve a fair and full reply, or at least some honourable sort of concession, that the subject would not bear it.

For surely no method of answering the Representer could be more complete, honest, and manly than this was ; nor serve better to put all those, for whose sakes books are written,

into a way of judging what Popery indeed is, and whether we have rightly condemned it or no, if they were not already satisfied in these things; especially because all was done with that plainness and perspicuity, that if the discourse was in any particular greatly defective, it could not but be obvious to an adversary, that was, it seems, thought a fit person by his superiors to represent Popery to this kingdom, and to defend it against this Church.

The first Reply of the Representer.

To this answer the Representer published a reply under the title of Reflections upon it. Now did he in these Reflections undertake to shew from point to point, that the Answerer had without cause corrected either the misrepresenting or the representing side, where he undertook to correct them? Did he, as the Answerer has done before him, take the questions in their order, to examine how they were stated, and where need was, did he pretend to state them better? Nay, did he bear up fairly to any one point of representation that his adversary thought fit to alter, and try by the force of his learning to reduce it to what it was when he left it? No truly, his mind did not serve him for stating of questions.

But did he not stand up in defence of his anathemas which his Answerer charged, not without giving reasons for it, with art and sophistry? No, he did not so much as offer at it.

What then was the business of his Reflections? Did they turn upon our reasons against Popery as represented by the Representer? No, sure; nor was it likely that he should be forward to answer our arguments, that had no fancy to defend his own.

What! Did he not betake himself to make good his own particular arguments in behalf of Popery, against his adversary's answers? Nothing less, I assure you; he did not take care so much as of one argument belonging to any one point, but fairly left them all to take their fortune: is it not enough for a man to bring arguments, but he must be troubled to defend them? Well; from this time forward, the Representer's business was not to dispute, but to represent. But was it so from the beginning? The Representer indeed has ever since so vehemently disclaimed disputing, that perhaps he only represented at first. Let us therefore try that a little.

Were there not three arguments for veneration of images, and for praying to saints? Were not Moses, Job, Stephen,

the Romans, the Corinthians, the Ephesians, and almost every sick person that desires the prayers of the congregation, engaged one way or other? Did he not argue for transubstantiation from our Saviour's words, from the power of God, from the incompetency of sense and reason to judge in this, no less than in some other cases? I think this is disputing. There were three texts of Scripture to justify the restraining of Christian people from reading the Scripture. And if they are not vanished out of the book, there are about seven reasons for communion in one kind: the 12th chapter of the 2nd book of Maccabees was once thought one good authority for the doctrine of purgatory; and St. Matth. xii. 32, another; and a little pretence of antiquity there was beside, and three or four more reasons for it; and in this strain the book went all along. Now this I say, those arguments were not made by the Answerer, but they were answered by him, and so were all the rest, and now they may go shift for themselves.

And yet this is the gentleman, who with no small opinion of himself, takes his adversary to task "for letting his arguments drop;" nay, "for not saying one word to all his own reasons pressed against himself;* but letting the matter fall very cautiously, when it comes to his own turn of disputing and defending his own reasonings, and that too in a case directly appertaining to our main point of representing," &c. Now this is a biting accusation, if it be a true one; and before we part, I hope we shall have a word or two about that. But if it were as true, as I am well assured it is false, the Representer, of all men living, should have made no words of it; and that not only because himself is a most notorious example of forsaking his own arguments in their distress, but because his adversary was so generous to wink at him when he stole off from his disputing post upon the very first attack that was made upon him. For I do not remember that he charges him with this, in shewing the progress of the controversy; and indeed, considering all his other advantages, there was no need of it. So that if the Representer had been content, this might have been forgotten still; but if a man owes himself a shame, he does well to pay it.

Well, but what went the Reflections upon all this while? By this time I think a stranger may guess the truth, and that is, that the Reflections were to flutter up and down between the

* Reply, p. 2, 3, 4, &c.

answer to the introduction and the answer to the book; and to settle no where. And now I shall give as short and faithful an abstract of them as I can. In the answer to the introduction, the Answerer declared himself unsatisfied with the "Representer's method to clear his party from misrepresentations;" and particularly, that he should make his own "ignorant, childish, or wilful mistakes," the Protestant representations of Popery, as, "that the Papists are never permitted to hear sermons which they are able to understand," and the like. Now from hence the Representer desires leave to assure his friends, that "the Protestant representations of Popery are ignorant, childish, or wilful mistakes."* One would not have expected so mean a cavil, so soon after he had promised most material points;† but because I find in his protesting Reply, that he is ashamed to own it, I shall take no further notice of this, than to tell him, he ought to have been more ashamed to deny it; it being so manifest, that what the Answerer said of some of his misrepresentations, he applied to all that himself calls misrepresentations,‡ that his utmost art will never be able to disguise it to any man that will take so much fruitless pains as to compare the places. But to proceed.

1. Whereas the Answerer justly exposed him for pretending "to draw his misrepresentations exactly according to his own apprehensions,"§ when himself was a Protestant; he now affirms that he can justify his Protestant characters of Papists by Protestant books, which he names, and out of one of them (Sutcliffe's Survey), he produces some sharp sayings concerning Popery. Nay, he thinks to defend his complaints of misrepresentation, by those very words of the Answerer concerning that Popery which the Representer allows. "We can never yield to it without betraying the truth, renouncing our senses and our reason, wounding our consciences," &c.

2. Whereas the Answerer excepted against his representing part, wherein he pretends to keep to a rule, that the Representer shewed no authority that he, a private man, had to interpret the rule in his own sense against the judgment of great divines, as in the question of the Pope's personal infallibility; and against the determinations of Popes and Councils, as in the question concerning the deposing power. The Representer replies,|| "that he followed the Council of Trent," which he

* Reply, p. 4. † P. 1.

§ P. 2, 3.

‡ Answ. p. 10. Rep. p. 3, 4.

|| P. 5, 6.

does not interpret, but takes in the sense of the Catechism : "that he also kept to Veron's Rule of Faith, and to the Bishop of Condom's Exposition, so highly approved by Pope and Cardinals," &c. As to the instances, having first ran to the book for two more, he comes back with them to the two that were mentioned, and replies, 1. "That whereas he limited the power of the saints to help us by their prayers, he followed the Council, and the Catechism, and the Bishop of Condom.* 2. That he did not qualify the doctrine of merit without authority, since it is so qualified by Trid. sess. 6. can. 26. 3. That the Pope's personal infallibility is not determined by a General Council. 4. That the deposing power was never established under an anathema, as a doctrinal point;† and those two are therefore no articles of faith."

3. He makes these reflections upon the Answerer's proceeding in the book : "That he either, 1. owns part of the Representer's ‡ doctrine to be the established belief of the Church of England : or, 2. does without good reason deny part of it to be the doctrine of the Roman Church, appealing from the definitions of their Councils and sense of their Church, either to some expressions found in old Mass-books and Rituals, &c. or to some external actions, in case of respect shewn to images and saints, as bowing, kneeling, &c.§ Or, finally, to private authors."|| Upon which follows a grievous complaint of misrepresenting upon the last account.

4. From hence he goes back to the answer to the introduction, where he was charged for saying, "that the Pope's ¶ orders are to be obeyed, whether he be infallible or not:" from whence it follows, "that Papists are bound to act when the Pope shall require it, according to the deposing power." He replies, "that he gives no more to the Pope than to civil sovereigns, whose authority is not so absolute and unconfined, but to some of their decrees there may be just exception."

5. From hence he flings again into the middle of the book,** and blames the Answerer for "scouting among the schoolmen, till the question about dispensations to lie or forswear was lost ; and that he offered no proof, that the dispensing power was to be kept up as a mystery, and not used but upon weighty causes." Then he leaps into the chapter of purgatory,†† and affirms, "that St. Perpetua's vision is not the foundation of purgatory, but only used by him as a marginal

* P. 7, 8.

† P. 9, 10

‡ P. 11.

§ P. 12.

|| P. 13, 14.

¶ P. 15, 16.

** P. 16.

†† P. 17.

citation amongst many others.* Then a complaint of misrepresentation again; and because complaints are not likely to convince us, "Let us," says he, "depend upon an experience;† do but give your assent to those articles of faith in the very form and manner, as I have stated them in the character of a Papist Represented, and if you are not admitted into our communion, I will confess that I have abused the world."

Thus far the Reflections. It is now time to compare things, and to see how much of the cause is left standing.

I pass it by, that the answer to the introduction, upon which the Representer‡ spent his main strength, is in many most material points untouched by the Reflections: but this is a small matter: for,

1. He has dropped the defence of his double characters, his representations and misrepresentations; for instead of going on with his adversary in those thirty-seven points, with which himself led the way, he does nothing but nibble about three or four of them, and that without taking notice of the tenth part of what was said by his adversary to fix the true state of the controversy even about them: he has indeed thrown about four loose general exceptions, amongst the thirty-seven chapters in which the Answerer represented the several doctrines and practices of the Church of Rome; but he has not with any one of these exceptions come up fairly to what the Answerer has said upon any one particular point; and therefore I add,

2. That for anything our Representer has done to shew the contrary, the Answerer has truly represented the doctrines and practices of the Church of Rome. And then we have great encouragement to turn Papists, since the Representer tells us, "that if the Answerer has truly represented the doctrines of the Church of Rome: he, the Representer, would as soon be a Turk as a Papist."

3. He has absolutely dropped the defence of all his own arguments, not so much as pretending to shew where the answers went upon a wrong state of the question; no, nor trying to reinforce his arguments, where the state of the controversy was agreed upon on both sides: so that, for ought I can see, the Representer fell sick of his thirty-seven chapters all at once, both as to matter of representation and dispute: and this I think was pretty well for the first reply.

* P. 18.

† P. 19.

‡ See for this Ans. to Pap. Protest. p. 128.

The Second Answer to the Representer, being a Reply to his Reflections.

But we are to thank the Reflections for one good thing, and that is for the answer which they drew from another learned hand, under the title of a "Papist not misrepresented by Protestants:" in which I shall make bold to leave out several material points, which the Answerer offered to consideration, and take notice of no more than what I think may serve to shew with what sincerity on the one side, and insincerity on the other, this controversy has been managed. Wherefore,

1 Whereas the Representer chose to justify his complaints of misrepresentations, not by taking the first Answerer's representations into examination, but by referring us to other books, and to Sutcliff's sharp censures of Popery; the second Answerer considered that the Representer called the censures which Protestants put upon the avowed doctrines and practices of the Church of Rome, misrepresentations: which was in the first book discernible enough, and spoken of in the answer to it; but was so grossly owned in his second book, that no man could now doubt of it: for he made his Answerer guilty of misrepresentation for saying, "that we cannot yield to that Popery which the Representer himself allows, without betraying the truth," &c.* This answer therefore blames him for putting into the Protestant representations of Popery, those faults which we find, and those ill consequences which we charge upon Popery, as if we would make the world believe, that Papists think as ill of what themselves profess and practise, as we do:† and much more for putting these consequences, as owned by Papists, in the front of the Protestant characters of them, as if we pretended, they were the first principles of Popery. As for the doctrines and practices of the Roman Church, which we charge them with, the Representer generally owned them; but he disowned, as he easily might, the belief of those consequences and interpretations which we charge upon them. And therefore his putting them into the Protestant characters of a Papist, was his own artifice of laying the fouler colours upon Popery on the one side, that it might look the fairer, when he took them off, on the other. Now to prevent these deceits for the future, this answer goes through the thirty-seven articles again,‡ to shew under each head, what we charge upon them as their doctrines and practices; which is properly matter of

* A Pap. not misrepr. p. 4.

† P. 5.

‡ P. 6. to p. 40.

representation: and likewise what we charge upon such doctrines and practices, which is properly matter of dispute: by the confounding of which two things the Representer had made a colour for his unjust complaints of misrepresentation.

2. Whereas he pretended that he never delivered his own private sense and opinion in representing a Papist;* the Answerer replies, that he certainly does so, when he determines concerning questions which are disputed among themselves, whether they be articles of faith, or not; and that the Catechism may be interpreted by a private spirit, as well as the Council. That Veron's rule had no more authority than the Representer's characters. That Bellarmine's controversies had attestation from the Pope, as well as the Bishop of Condom's Exposition: and that Canus himself, who is referred to by the Representer, acknowledges that the Pope's approbation is not always to be accounted the judgment of the Apostolic See. As to the instances, the Answerer shews, 1. "Of his limiting the power of the saints to their prayers;"† that no such limitation of their aid and assistance, is to be found in the Council; that the Representer would take no notice of what his first Answerer had said, to shew that no such limitation was intended in the Council or the Catechism; and that he did not find this limitation in the Bishop of Condom.‡ 2. Of Merit; that the twenty-sixth canon of the sixth session, mentions nothing of it; and that it is clear from chap. 16. of that session, that they make good works truly and properly meritorious of eternal life, though they grant the grace of God, and the merits of Christ, to be the cause of their own merits. Finally, that the Answerer did not appeal to the thirty-second canon§ to oppose the Representer's qualification of the doctrine of merit,|| and was therefore unconcerned in his defence of it. 3. As to the Pope's personal Infallibility; that he denies it to be of faith, and makes it but a school point; whilst there are as many who deny it to be a school point, and make it a matter of their faith. That the want of positive determination by a General Council, does not prove it to be no matter of faith, because neither the infallibility of a General Council, nor of the Church, is positively determined by a General Council. That if infallibility must be somewhere amongst them, they have the best reason that place it in the Pope. 4. As to the deposing doctrine, the Answerer shewed largely and clearly,

* P. 44, 45.

† P. 45, 46.

‡ P. 12, 13.

§ P. 46.

|| P. 47, 48.

that articles of faith may be, and have been decreed without anathemas;* that the deposing decree includes a doctrinal point;† that if it were merely a point of discipline and government,‡ they must either acknowledge it lawful for the Church to depose heretical princes, or consent that the Church is not secured from making wicked decrees in things that concern the whole Christian world. That when the Representer says, that some decrees of Trent are not universally received, he does not tell us that the Council had no authority to make them, and to oblige princes to receive them. And lastly, that the Pope's letting so many asserters of the no-deposing power to pass without any censure of heresy, does not argue a change of their doctrine, but only of the times.§

3. To the Representer's reflections upon the Answerer's way of proceeding, as that, 1. "He owns in some part the Representer's doctrine to be the established doctrine of the Church of England;" the second Answerer charges him with foul misrepresentation upon this account, inasmuch as the first Answerer owned nothing which is peculiar to the faith of a Papist, as distinguished from the common faith of Christians; and that the Representer might as well have said, "that because Protestants own that Christ is to be worshipped, therefore they in part own the doctrine of the Church of Rome, that Christ is to be worshipped by images."|| And this he shewed to be the very case in every one of those six or seven points, which the Representer only named, but did not think fit to insist upon, to shew how his reflection was applicable to them. 2. And that the first Answerer appealed from the definitions of their Church, &c. 1. "To some expositions found in old mass-books and rituals." This Answerer says, that he could find but one instance of this, relating to the worship of the Virgin Mary;¶ viz. that scandalous hymn, *O felix Puerpera*, &c. But that their Church is accountable for her old missals, which were the allowed and established offices of worship; that even this has never been condemned; but that Monsieur Widenfelt's book was condemned at Rome, which was writ to bring the people to a bare *Ora pro nobis* to the blessed Virgin.** 2. "To some external action, as in case of respect shewn to images and saints." To this the Answerer says, that the Representer brings in this exception, without

* P. 49.

† P. 54.

‡ P. 56.

§ P. 57.

|| P. 59, 60, 61.

¶ P. 62, 63.

** P. 63.

taking the least notice of what his adversary said concerning external adoration, that it is a part of divine worship;* and that the Council of Trent requires it should be given to images. He shews further, that since there is such a thing as external and visible idolatry; an idolatrous action is nevertheless such, for the intention of him that is guilty of it not to commit idolatry;† that the worship of the invisible inhabitants of the other world, though with such external acts as may be paid to creatures, has always been accounted religious worship;‡ that as the degrees of civil honour are distinguished by the sight of the object; so one certain distinction between civil and religious is, that the worship of an invisible object is always religious;§ and that to worship the image of an invisible being, must therefore be religious worship also; because it is referred to the prototype. 3. "To the sentiments of private authors." And here the present Answerer challenges him to give one instance wherein the judgment of private authors was, as he pretended, set up against the declared sense of their Councils and Church: and moreover shews what use was made of private authors, by particular instances; and that sometimes recourse is necessary to be had to them, and to the general practice of their Church, to know the sense of their Church.||

4. Whereas the Representer avoided the charge of their being obliged by his doctrine to obey the Pope, when he commands them to act in pursuance of the deposing power; by pretending that the decrees of Popes may be excepted against no less than the commands of civil sovereigns, as the case may be. The Answerer does acknowledge this reply to be good,¶ if the Representer be sincere in the application, and will grant the deposing decree to command a sin; and that Bellarmine and Canus were mistaken in asserting, "that Popes and General Councils can make no sinful decrees relating to the whole Church."

5. To the complaint of discoursing upon dispensations out of the schoolmen, and bearing the reader into a belief, "that the dispensing power was kept as a mystery, to be used upon weighty occasions,"** &c. the present Answerer says, that there was reason for the former, this being one of the instances wherein the whole sense of their Church is not to be had, but

* P. 64.

† P. 65.

‡ P. 66.

§ P. 67.

|| P. 68, 69.

¶ P. 58.

** P. 69.

from the practices of Popes, and the opinions of their great men. To the latter, that their own doctors had declared it, as the Answerer had shewn, before he said it himself. Then as to St. Perpetua's vision, "that if he did not think it gave some credit to the doctrine of purgatory,"* it was mentioned by him to no purpose. Finally, to the Representer's invitation of us to come over to their Church upon his terms, with promise of acceptance; the Answerer returns, "that he must like their faith better first." And certainly the invitation was something unseasonable, before the Representer had answered our reasons against that Popery which himself allows. And this for the second answer.

The Second Reply of the Representer, being an Answer to a Papist not misrepresented by Protestants.

The second reply comes forth under the title of "Papists protesting against Protestant Popery."† In which the Representer, beginning with a defence of himself as to his construction of the wilful mistakes (see before, p. 8), which if he pleases shall be forgotten from this time forward: falls a wondering that there should be such a noise about exposing of their doctrines to open view; declares, that though he discovered what he thought,‡ and sometimes said briefly, why; yet he made not disputing his business; and knows not how this should be taken as a piece of controversy against the Church of England, which he had not charged of misrepresentation, nor any body else, but those only in general that are guilty. He complains that his second Answerer makes that which they call Misrepresentation, to be in all the material points, a representation of the avowed doctrine and practice of the Church of Rome;§ and protests, "that if Popery be guilty of what he saith, it cannot enter into his thoughts there is any room for it in heaven." For the very title of his book "is a condemnation of the religion to all those horrid shapes it has been at any time exposed in by the members of the Reformation:"|| and so is his pretence, that "we charge Papists with nothing but what they expressly profess to believe, and what they practise." But since they must not learn what Papists believe from the Council and the Catechism, but from the writings and sermons of Protestants; he is resolved to give us a taste of their way of representing Popery; and therefore,

* P. 70.

† Pap. Prot. p. 4.

‡ P. 5.

§ P. 6.

|| P. 7.

1. He recites several passages wherein Popery is misrepresented, as he will have it, out of a book of John, sometime Lord Archbishop of York, and a book of Dr. Beard, and Sutcliffe's Survey,* and the Book of Homilies. And in conclusion he tells us, "that this is the Protestant Popery, which since he protests against no less than the Answerer, Protestants and Papists may now shake hands; and what possibility is there of farther divisions?" But if this be intended for a true representation of Popery, Roman Catholics suffer under the greatest injustice imaginable. And then follows a vehement expostulation against the iniquity of such misrepresentation.† And whereas the Answerer blamed him for putting into the Protestant character of a Papist those ill consequences we charge upon their doctrines and practices, as if we pretended that they think of their own profession and practice just as we do: he replies, that this is a "a pretty speculative quarrel, and a quaint conceit,‡ but lost, for coming in a wrong place." For the Representor's business was to draw the character of a Papist, as it lies in the people's heads, who when they hear one declaiming against Popery, do not distinguish between antecedents and consequents, between the doctrine of the Papists, and the fault we find with it, but swallow up all in the lump; and whoever supposes otherwise, must conclude them to be better at separating, than the chemists, and that in subtle § distinctions they are able to outdo Aristotle himself. This is, in short, what he says with much circumstance, and no little contentment, for four pages together; and it is all that he thinks fit to return to his Answerer's careful distinction between matters of representation and of dispute, through all the particulars: for though he confesses it is learnedly done, yet the almost forty pages about it might have been spared, because "this distinction is not to be found in the notion || the people have of Popery."

For the rest, about his denying the belief of our interpretations, and the two other particulars, p. 24: they are so little to the purpose, that I can afford them no room in this abstract; and he that will not take my word for it, may go to the Answer to Pap. Prot. p. 20, 21, and there satisfy himself.

2. To his adversary's question, whether the Catechism may not be expounded by a private spirit, as well as the Council? He says, "thus a question or two is a full confutation of the

* P. 9. to p. 17.

† P. 18.

‡ P. 20.

§ P. 22.

|| P. 23.

reflector." To the testimony of Canus, "that that is not to be accounted the judgment of the Apostolic See, which is given only by the Bishop of Rome, privately, maliciously, and inconsiderately," &c. he replies, "that so reverend* an authority as that of the Bishop of Condom, is not to be thus overthrown, since his Exposition was examined with all due deliberation, approved with all solemnity, &c. and recommended by his Holiness to be read by all the faithful :"[†] upon which occasion he puts himself into some heat, that we who protest against their religion, should pretend to understand it better than a Catholic prelate eminent in the Church, &c., and than those who depend upon it for their salvation.[‡] As to the instances ; and, 1. Of the invocation of saints, he says, their aid and assistance is limited to their prayers, by the Bishop of Condom, and cites the place ; but to what his adversary said concerning the intention of the Council and of the Catechism in this matter, he says nothing. The instance of merit he passes by : but, 2ndly, and 3rdly, as to the Pope's personal infallibility,[§] and the deposing power, he pleads the authority of the Bishop of Condom, that they are no more than matters of school debate : and, as if he had been in good earnest at first, he does again promise we shall be admitted into his Church without the belief of these articles : so that he has every way represented the faith of a Papist aright ; and now has found out something in his adversary to be answered with a smile, that a "Protestant should never understand the faith of a Papist better than a Papist himself does."^{||} And thus all being guarded by the Bishop of Condom's authority, and his own proposal, it was his mere civility to take any notice of his adversary's answers to his argument about the deposing power, from the want of an anathema to the decree. And so he replies, 1. That every thing is not an article of faith, which is declared in a General Council, without an anathema. 2 That to decree what shall be done,[¶] does not include a virtual definition of doctrine, as he thinks his adversary himself shewed under the next particular, from the Council of the Apostles at Jerusalem. 3. That the deposing decree does not "relate to things necessary to salvation, nor concerns the whole Church."^{**} And whereas his adversary imputes the escape of those that oppose this decree, to a change of times, and the Pope's want of power, he tells us, that oracles are ceased now-a-days.

* P. 25.

† P. 26.

‡ P. 27.

§ P. 28, 29.

|| P. 30.

¶ P. 30, 31.

** P. 32.

As to veneration of images, he says, that although "acts of honour expressed to any image that has relation to some invisible being, be supposed a religious honour, yet all religious respect and honour is not so a divine honour, as to make a god constructively of the thing to which it is paid :"* otherwise bowing to the altar, and to the name of Jesus, cannot be excused, since these things relate † to the invisible inhabitants of the other world ; nay, all religious respect besides to God, must then be constructive idolatry : therefore, ‡ as the different kinds and degrees of civil honour are distinguished by the sight of the objects, though the external acts are the same, so the different kinds and degrees of religious honours are distinguished by the intention of the givers, and by circumstances. He says further, as to the unalterableness of the nature of actions determined by a law. That § if this makes the intention of doing no evil in bowing or kneeling to an image, unable to excuse those from sin, who do this forbidden thing ; this strikes as severely at bowing to the altar, and kneeling to the sacrament, as at them, since the actions forbidden are the same part of divine worship in both cases. Finally, that || a Quaker may justify his yeas and nays, by his adversary's rule, that no intention can alter the nature of actions determined by a divine law, since it is said, Matth. v. 34, "Swear not at all, but let your communication," &c. And now to give him his due, setting aside the frivolous instance of the Quaker, he has in this particular come up fairly to his adversary, and said what deserves to be considered. Then he concludes with two or three requests, which he hopes are not unreasonable ; to which his adversary gave such reasonable answers, that we have heard of them no more since that time (See *Answ. to Pap. Prot.* p. 124, 126), and therefore we have no reason to be troubled with them here. And so let us come to a reckoning.

1. He grants his adversary's distinction throughout, between matters of representation and matters of dispute ; which distinction, since himself did not observe, he either wanted the skill or the honesty of a representer.

2. The defence of his argument, that the Pope's personal infallibility is not of faith, from no General Council's having determined it, is dropped.

3. He will not be brought to say, whether the Council of

* P. 33.

† P. 34

‡ P. 35.

§ P. 36.

|| P. 36, 37.

Trent had, or had not authority to oblige princes to receive those decrees which are not universally received; and so the defence of his argument, from some decrees not being received, is dropped.

4. His solemn cavil, that the first Answerer owned some part of his (the Representer's) doctrine, to be the established doctrine of the Church of England; and his objection against him for appealing to old mass-books and rituals, and that other for appealing to private authors, are all three dropped.

5. He will not say that the deposing decree commands a sin; and so his defence of himself against his first Answerer's charge, that by his principles he is bound upon the Pope's command to act according to the deposing power, is dropped.

His complaints against his first Answerer's representing the matter of dispensations; and his note upon St. Perpetua's vision, are dropped; but his invitation of us to come over to the Church of Rome upon his terms, is not dropped; for we thank him, he has invited us again.

The Third Answer to the Representer, being an Answer to a Papist protesting against Protestant Popery.

To the Representer's wonder, that such ado should be made about his first book, the Answerer says, that a "misrepresenter is so foul a character,* that no man can wonder if we think ourselves concerned to wipe it off;" which surely may be done without offence to any, but those that meant us in the general accusation. To his complaint that the Answerer makes, all that which they call misrepresentation, to be in "all the material points a representation of the avowed doctrine and practice of the Church of Rome;" he says, that he has done him all the service he can in distinguishing between matters of fact, wherein if we charge them wrong, we do indeed misrepresent them; and matters of dispute, in which, if we should charge them wrong, it is not misrepresentation, but merely a wrong judgment upon what they profess and practise. And he had already shewn, that "all matters of fact (excepting some few points) in the character of a Papist misrepresented, are confessed and defended in the character of a Papist represented."† Now representation or misrepresentation is properly about matters of fact. But as for the consequences we charge upon their doctrines and practices, and which were put into the misrepresenting side, to be taken off again in the representing

* P. 1.

† P. 2.

side; they are not matters of representation, but of dispute. To this purpose the Answerer argues, leaving the Representer to apply these plain things to his protestation against Protestant Popery; which amounts to thus much, that it could “never enter into him, that there should be any room for Popery in heaven; and that he would as soon be a Turk as a Papist,” if he thought as ill of the confessed doctrines and practices of the Church of Rome, as we do. Which would be a wise speech, no doubt, though we hope a true one. For the rest he saith, that “his title related only to his own book;* and the book, to the character of a Papist misrepresented;” and therefore it is hard that he must be drawn in to answer for more than he knows, even for all that any Protestant may have said concerning Popery since the Reformation; and he thinks it strange, that the Representer, “instead of defending his own characters, should hunt about for new misrepresentations for him to answer.” For since he has allowed the distinction between matters of representation and dispute, and can find no fault with his adversary’s performance about it; it† should seem we are agreed upon the representation of Popery now at last, and therefore unless he were ashamed of his own Popery, now we had clearly found it, why should he divert from that, to new complaints of their being misrepresented by others?

The Answerer however was resolved to see what occasion there was for this fresh complaint.

1. And he shews, that‡ “if what was transcribed out of the foresaid Archbishop of York’s book, be misrepresentation, it is not a Protestant, but a Popish misrepresentation: for the Archbishop cites his authors for what he says, though the Representer left them out;” and this the Answerer thought good to shew from point to point; and concludes, that “though every doctrine found in Popish authors, ought not presently to be accounted an article of the Romish faith; yet a Church” so watchful to purge, expunge, and censure in all cases where her interest is concerned, is responsible for those doctrines, which have her toleration and license, and which any “man among them is allowed to teach, and to believe.” As for Dr. Beard, and Mr. Sutcliff, he says, those sayings§ do not concern representing, but disputing; and that the Representer had unfaithfully concealed, either their authorities or their reasons, which had made the thing plain; or curtailed their sayings, as

* P. 3.

† P. 4.

‡ P. 5, 6, 7, 8, 9.

§ P. 10, 11, 12, 13.

he shews by several instances out of Mr. Sutcliff; but that when such consequences are charged upon Popery, it is more to the purpose to confute them, than to complain of misrepresentation. Finally, as to the book of Homilies, those things which he hath taken out of it, as the Answerer tells him, do no more than shew* the judgment of our Church about the worship of saints and images in the Church of Rome; in which he cannot prove us to be misrepresenters, otherwise than by confuting our arguments; which yet would but shew that we make a wrong judgment in a matter of dispute, not that we misrepresent a matter of fact. Upon this, the Answerer shews, that Papists profess and practise the same things that ever they did; and that all this grievous cry of misrepresenting, is grounded upon nothing else, but a protestation, that they do not believe those ill things of their own doctrine and practice, which we do;† which although it be a new business, yet there was no reason for it, since we never said they did. In the mean time, the cause is the same that ever it was, which is a sufficient answer to all that he saith of Protestants and Papists shaking hands, &c. And whereas he makes the distinction between representation and dispute, to be a speculation above the vulgar, and so was not to be regarded by him who drew the character of a Papist as it lay in the people's heads; the Answerer thinks, that he who undertakes to make characters, is bound to consider what belongs to it; and withal,‡ that our people are not so silly as to think (for instance) that Papists think the worship of images to be idolatry: or that idolatry is lawful, because they worship images; but that if he wrote his characters for the information of such vulgar heads as he fancies, he wrote to inform those that can neither write nor read.§

2. As to his representing, that he did it not by a private spirit, since he followed the Catechism; the Answerer had reason to ask, whether the Catechism may not be interpreted by a private spirit as well as the Council, since their divines differ in the interpretation of both; and as for the Pope's approbation, he saith that Bellarmine's|| controversies had it, as well as the Bishop of Condom's Exposition; to which the Representers would say nothing; and he now says, that by Canus's rule, the said Bishop's Exposition has not the autho-

* P. 14.

† P. 15, 16.

‡ P. 17, 18, 19.

§ P. 20.

|| P. 21.

rity of the Apostolic See, unless the Pope had given judgment for it *ex cathedra*,* which the Representer also would take no notice of: but what he says further concerning the nature and design of the approbations given to the Bishop of Condom, I shall wholly pass over, since it is by this time somewhat plain, that this Bishop's authority has enough to do to shift for itself, and is not in a condition to spare any help to his friends. As to the limitation of the aid of the saints to their prayers, he acknowledges that it is to be found in the Bishop of Condom, though he missed it,† because it came not in the right place. But whereas the Representer justifies his renouncing the Pope's personal infallibility, and the deposing doctrine, by the authority of the said Bishop; the Answerer plainly shews the Bishop's great judgment, in having ordered matters so, as to save himself both with Protestants, and with the Pope. To the Representer's second invitation, he answers, by making this proposal,‡ whether their Church would refuse him admittance, if he should come in upon Bellarmine's terms in these points, which contradict the Representer's, though there be no reason for this dispute, since, as he said before, he likes not the Roman faith§ as the Representer has described it? Now to his replies in behalf of the deposing doctrine being no article of faith, the Answerer says, 1. That whereas the Representer would prove it was not so, because no anathema was fixed to the decree; it is something strange, that he should now be content to say, every thing is not an article of faith, which is declared without an anathema; for this is next to a downright concession that his adversary had baffled his argument; and shews manifestly that he would seem to say something, when he knew he had nothing to say to the purpose. 2. He shews that the decree of the Council at Jerusalem did include a virtual definition of doctrine. And, 3. That the deposing decree concerns the whole Church; and if it be a wicked decree, that it relates to a thing necessary to salvation, by commanding to do that which it is necessary to salvation not to do; and therefore he expects the Representer's further consideration of his three answers.

3. Concerning the worship of images, the Representer bids so fair for a dispute, that the Answerer took the occasion, and examined not only what the Bishop of Condom hath delivered upon it, but the several ways of stating it by their divines;

* P. 22.

† P. 118.

‡ P. 15.

§ P. 16.

shewing that their images are representatives to receive worship in the name and stead of the prototypes; that in this notion image-worship is condemned in the Scripture, and in that the evil of it consisted; a more particular abridgment of that just discourse upon this subject I cannot make, without either wronging the Answerer, or detaining the reader here too long, and therefore I refer him also to the book itself for an answer to the charge upon bowing towards the altar, &c.* And to the apology for image-worship,† from the degree of the honour that is given to images: and to the Representer's objections against that way of distinguishing religious from civil worship,‡ by making that to be religious which is given to the invisible inhabitants of the other world;§ and likewise to the pretended parity of reason in the Quaker's case. And thus much may serve for the answer to Papists protesting against Protestant Popery.

The Third Reply of the Representer, in return to the foregoing Answer.

The Representer finds as little comfort in protesting, as disputing, and so falls to "accommodate the difference between the Representer and the Answerer;" and calls his work an Amicable Accommodation. For now he grants the Protestants are not guilty of misrepresentation in a strict proper sense, and is very sorry that he and his Answerer|| understood one another no better before: he thinks indeed it was his Answerer's fault, not to conceive him right at first; and that if his book had never been answered, the peace had never been broke; but he is persuaded the difference may be yet compounded;¶ for the case at first was no more than this, that he perceiving the unchristian hatred which grew in the vulgar, upon that false notion of Popery, which our misconstructions,** &c. had drawn in their imaginations; he, I say, good man! no less in charity to Protestants, than in justice to Papists, drew his double characters, to shew how Popery is misrepresented.†† But then comes an adversary and says, "he has proved that the character of a Papist misrepresented contains nothing in it, which in a strict and proper sense can be called a misrepresentation." Now really he never meant to fight for a word; and had he but imagined, that his adversary had con-

* P. 83.

† P. 106, &c.

‡ P. 37, 38, 39, 40.

§ P. 123.

|| P. 1, 2.

¶ P. 3.

** P. 4.

†† P. 5.

tended for no more,* he would have spared him the charges and sweat of laying down his proofs the second time.

Wherefore to end the strife, he "solemnly declares, that the title of the Papist Misrepresented, is not to be taken in its strict and proper sense, as misrepresenting signifies only downright lying, or falsely charging matter of fact, the whole character being not indeed of this nature; but in its larger or less proper sense, as it comprehends both lying, calumniating, misinterpreting, reproaching, misconstruing, misjudging, and whatever else of this kind."

But that we may know what a lover of peace he is, he must assure the Answerer, that "this condescension is purely out of good nature;† for betwixt friends, he doth not think the Answerer has advanced any thing that has the face of a proof, that there can be no misrepresenting where there is an agreement about matter of fact."

"Representing (he says) being nothing more than shewing a thing as it is in itself; as many ways as a thing can be shewn, otherwise than it is in itself, so many ways may it be properly misrepresented;" so that the description must agree with the thing, not only in matter of fact, but likewise in respect of motive, circumstance, intention, end," &c.‡ But according to the Answerer's rule, had the two tribes and a half been declared guilty of setting up altar against altar; and Hannah been set out amongst her neighbours for a drunken gossip;§ here had been no misrepresentation, because of some matter of fact in the case. The elders too, that offered proof against Susanna, since they saw her in the garden, &c. were no misrepresenters:¶ nor the Jews against our Saviour; nor infidels against the Apostles and Christians; nor shall any be excluded from a share in this favour, but they that have "malice enough to calumniate, but want wit to give a reason for what they do," &c. So much was the Representer overcome with pure good nature, that for peace sake he would yield to a principle that can do such things as these, if his word may be taken for the reason; but we have another reason in the wind presently; for if this same principle which he has ordered to protect the lowdest defamations and perjuries, will but do its office upon the Church of England, he has had his reward: and so he shews what execution he can do in the mouth of some zealous brother, whose honour and interest en-

* P. 6.

† P. 7.

‡ P. 8.

§ P. 9.

¶ P. 11.

gages him to set out the Church of England, as we represent the Church of Rome; to which purpose he puts a sermon into his mouth, which whether it be a copy or an original, the Dissenters may say when they please. But the heads of it are such as these,

After a solemn preface of exhortation to keep out of the swing and the sweep of the dragon's tail, he lays down his doctrine, "that the Church of England men's marks are the marks of the beast,"* which he proves by the large revenues and state of their prelates, who wear the mitre and crosier upon their coaches while they live, and upon their tombs when they are dead;† by the weekly bill of London, which shews that Mary has nineteen churches and Christ but three; by the pictures in their Bibles and Common Prayer Books; and by many other marks as good as these;‡ which because they stick fast to us, as he thinks, for any thing the Answerer has said, must come over again in another place, and therefore the less repetition shall serve now.§

Sermon being done, he asks whether this be misrepresenting in a strict and proper sense; and if not, he is contented that the word *misrepresenting*|| in his book should not be taken so, *i. e.* for downright lying; but, as we heard before, for wry interpretations, weak reasonings, &c. And here ends the Amicable Accommodation.

For his picking up new misrepresentations, he says he did it to shew that the former were not his own childish conceits: for leaving out the authorities of the Archbishop of York; that this makes nothing against him, because the question is not, what some private authors say, but, what the Church believes,¶ whose faith cannot be fairly represented from their books, though published by the authority of superiors:** for producing what Sutcliff laid to their charge, without producing his reasons; that his reasons were none of the Representer's concern, because they nothing belong to representing, nor has the Answerer put his approbation to them.††

He charges the Answerer with leaving out *propter Deum* in a citation out of the Pontifical, and this because the words were not for his purpose.

In conclusion, he is resolved not to dispute, since the "Answerer knows no reason for all this dispute," p. 26, and he cares

* P. 13, 14.

† P. 15.

‡ P. 16.

§ P. 17, 18, &c.

|| P. 34.

¶ P. 35.

** P. 36.

†† P. 37.

not whether the Answerer "likes his religion or not; he will be no other than a Representer still; for we wise converts do not love to go out of our way, but upon very good grounds: the Bishop of Condom has undertaken his own vindication;"* and if he does but come off as well as the Representer,† and it is strange if he should not, let Bellarmine and other eminent approved authors say what they can, he has no concern in it, but his Representation, and the Bishop's Exposition, are the authentic rule for the exposition of the Council of Trent; for the embracing the Catholic faith, as expounded by one, and proposed by the other, is sufficient for a person to be received into the communion of their Church.‡

We are now coming to the foot of the account; for besides other particulars of less moment that are dropped,

1. Whereas his only reply to the clear and particular distinctions of his Answerer between matters of representation and matters of dispute, was this, that these matters did not, and could not lie in vulgar heads, with that distinction; his defence of that reply, and consequently of his confused and deceitful way of representing, is wholly dropped.

2. The defence of his arguments, that the deposing power is no article of faith, is now at last wholly dropped.

3. His defence of the worship of images against his adversary's discourse is dropped; or to use his own words, he "took the freedom gravely to turn over his Answerer's occasional pages about it."§

And now if the reader will please to put all together, he will find by an easy computation, that this was the poor remainder of a controversy begun by the Representer upon no less than thirty-seven Articles: so that these points having had the hard fate to be served by the Representer as their fellows were before, I reckon that he has dropped and dropped, till the whole cause is dropped at last; but this is one of those things in which he is not concerned; for though the Papist misrepresented and represented, be in a very forsaken condition, yet himself, the Representer, was never more diverting, nor in better humour all his life: and who can blame a man for not being sorry for what can never be helped? And therefore since he sped no better with his grave understanding, it was not amiss to call a merry cause, upon misrepresenting in a strict and proper sense, and to bring in a fanatic representing the Church of England in a ridiculous sermon.

* P. 38.

† P. 39.

‡ P. 40.

§ P. 39.

The Fourth Answer to the Representer, being an Answer to the Amicable Accommodation.

This Answerer has no reason to be displeased, that the Representer now grants we do not misrepresent the Papists in a strict and proper sense, *viz.* by imputing such doctrines to them as they do not own.* But he says that the design of the Representer in his first book was to persuade our people that we were such misrepresenters; but that failing in the performance, he would now make good his title of misrepresenting in a less proper sense, inasmuch as he thinks we do unjustly condemn the doctrines and practices of the Church of Rome.† But why he should tax us for this at all, the Answerer wonders, and that very justly, one would think, because the Representer has sometime since disclaimed disputing, without which it cannot be seen whether we be misrepresenters or not in this less proper sense; and therefore he tells him, “that if he will vindicate the doctrines and practices of the Church of Rome, he must quit his retreat of character-making,‡ and fall to disputing as their fathers did;” in which, he is ready to join issue with them: but that it was by no means civil to charge us with lying, how prudent soever it might be upon another account, since if he proceeds in this way, he may be secure, that no civil person will care to dispute with him. Now whereas the Representer did in effect recall his grant, by attempting to prove largely, “that there may be a misrepresentation where there is an agreement about the matter of fact; because there may be misrepresentation upon other accounts, *viz.* in respect of motive. circumstance, intention, end,” &c. Here the Answerer shews that these things do indeed belong to true representing; but that they were too nicely distinguished by the Representer from matter of fact; for he had given him no occasion for the distinction, since he had considered these things in those matters which he charged upon the Church of Rome: for instance, “that not only worshipping of images, but the worshipper’s intentions, and all other circumstances, without which the nature of the fact cannot be thoroughly understood, were taken into consideration.” Then he shews through all the Representer’s instances, that the misrepresentations were in matters of fact;§ but wonders why he did not produce one instance of the like nature out of his answers, if he thought there were any. For

* P. 4.

† P. 6.

‡ P. 8.

§ P. 12.

what could he gain by shewing, that in such and such cases others have been misrepresenters, unless he proved withal, that we were misrepresenters in like cases? His instances shew, that they who tell a piece of a story, may misrepresent; but not that they do so, who faithfully relate the whole matter of fact, with all its circumstances; which is our case: and he has not produced one example to the contrary, though so to have done had been more to his purpose, than all his other instances. In short, this matter was so fully answered, that when we hear next of the Representer, we do not find one word more about it.

To the zealous brother's harangue, he says, though it be granted that the Dissenters misrepresent our Church, yet this does not prove that we misrepresent the Church of Rome;* and therefore this is nothing but a device to get rid of us, by throwing us upon the Dissenters. But "we are not for pursuing every new game, but will keep to our old scent."† And yet he has made the Dissenter say such silly things of us, as no Dissenter will own, unless he has heard them among the Quakers. This the Answerer plainly shewed through almost all his fifteen particulars of the charge against the Church of England, and by the way, where it was any thing needful, he taxed the unreasonableness and folly of the charge, which yet was more than he was bound to, since if it came to the trial, we have some reason to think that there is not a zealous brother in England, no nor friend neither, but would be ashamed to own it. So that his design of representing and misrepresenting, to which I may add the Representer's yielding in pure good nature, that henceforth misrepresenting shall be understood in its less proper sense, ends only in ridiculing the Church of England, with which we are content, if they will permit us truly to represent theirs.

To what the Representer offered for seeking out new misrepresentation, the sum of what is answered, is this, that it is in the main agreed what the matters of fact are with which the Papists may be charged; and since these only are the proper subject of representation, the ill consequences which Protestants have urged against their doctrines and practices, ought not to have been put into the character of a Papist misrepresented,‡ unless he could shew, that we say that Papists do believe those consequences: and therefore the Representer

* P. 15.

† P. 16.

‡ P. 24.

vainly endeavours to excuse himself for putting them into that character, by hunting about for new pretended misrepresentations, to employ his answer withal. This I gather to be the Answerer's sense, from his reference to what he had proved before.

As to the Archbishop of York, the Answerer says, "he did not misrepresent the Church of Rome in saying that Stapleton said, We must simply believe the Church of Rome whether it teach true or false."* The most that can be made of it is, that according to one of their allowed doctors, thus a Papist must believe. And therefore if it be a misrepresentation of the doctrine of the Church of Rome, Stapleton is to be thanked for it in the first place for saying so; and in the next, the Church of Rome for allowing him to say so; and then the Archbishop for reporting what he said, though he does not say that one doctor may make doctrines for the Church of Rome.

"The case of Mr. Sutcliff," he says, "is different," and he shews that he expressly distinguishes between what the Papists teach, and what himself concludes from such doctrines; and therefore that he does not misrepresent the Papists.† So that how little soever the Representer thought himself concerned in Sutcliff's reasonings, because reasoning belonged not to a Representer; yet surely it belonged to a Representer to distinguish between the doctrines we charge upon the Papists on the one side, and the arguments we bring against these doctrines on the other.

To the charge of omitting to render *propter Deum* into English, he says, "it was omitted he knows not how or why," but very justly blames the Representer for insinuating that it was dishonestly omitted, since it was the whole design of that discourse about the worship of images,‡ to shew that image-worship is evil, though God was worshipped by it. I will, upon this occasion add, that the Answerer could not but know his own foul dealing in this charge, which is so very manifest, that this injustice, if there were nothing else, does assure me that he must make another change before we can expect much sincerity from him.

With like honesty he disengages himself from all obligation to dispute concerning the worship of images, &c. 1. Because the Answerer "knows no reason for all this dispute,"

* P. 25.

† P. 26, 27.

‡ P. 28.

which words did not at all relate to that dispute, but to the question about the Bishop of Condom's authority. 2. He "was never concerned whether the Answerer liked his religion or not." But if he could have answered that discourse,* "all that the Answerer could have said would not have hindered him."

For the rest, the Answerer says, "that the Representer and the Bishop of Condom reasoned and argued at first as well as represented," and since their representation is offered as a rule by which we may be taken into the Roman Church, they were the more concerned to justify their own reasonings;† which, since it is declined, our people will be apt to think why Papists decline the dispute, who are never known to avoid disputing, when they think they can get anything by it. And thus the Answerer takes leave of the Representer, believing that this matter is driven as far as it will go.

The Fourth Reply of the Representer in behalf of his Amicable Accommodation.

This last Reply is made up :

1. Of insulting over the Answerer, for offering no more than he did in answer to the zealous brother's sermon against the Church of England.

2. Of more and more outcries upon the Protestants for misrepresenting the Papists.

But the particulars that come under these heads, together with his reflections, by the by, will be best produced in the following Answer, where I shall consider what reason he has for this kind of proceeding.

The Fifth Answer to the Representer, in return to his last Reply.

If the seven and thirty lost points had been recovered, the Representer could not have entered the lists with more seeming satisfaction in himself, than he shews in his last Reply ; but he has made a shift to forget them, and that is as good. What the Answerer said, that "the matter was driven as far as it would go," (whatever the Representer imagines) I find still to be true. For, with reference to the chief matter in dis-

* P. 29.

† P. 30.

pute betwixt us, we are parted ; and I think, never like to meet any more about it. Indeed, as to the manifold charge summed up against the Church of England, "that matter," as he truly observes, "is not driven as far as it will go." And it seems he intends to drive it farther and farther. But why that should ever come to be a matter of debate betwixt us, any one who considers the controversy from first to last, must needs wonder.

The design of what has been said on behalf of the Church of England, has been to make evident these three things :

1. That we do not charge the Papists with some things which the Representer will have us to charge them with.

2. That some things which he saith we falsely charge them with, are maintained and practised by them.

3. That, allowing them to maintain and practise only what themselves acknowledge that they do maintain and practise, yet there are sufficient reasons why we cannot comply with Popery, although refined after the newest fashion.

This is the sum of what has been argued on our side. Now, how comes this zealous brother's cant to be an answer to all this ? I know not, I must confess, how to imagine any Dissenter to be so ridiculous as to object against us what the Representer makes him to object. And without flattery or fawning, I may safely affirm that there are not many who do it. But suppose there should, will such their objections prove against the first particular above mentioned, that "we charge Papists with what we deny we charge them with ?" Or against the third, that "allowing them to maintain and practise, what themselves acknowledge that they maintain and practise, we ought to comply with Popery." I think that no man in his wits will assert this, and therefore we may justly ask what is to be done with all that has been said upon these particulars ? and whether there not having been any thing that is material urged against them, does not imply that there is nothing material to be urged ; and consequently, if the Answerer had not some reason to say, that "the matter was driven as far as it will go ?"

As to the second particular, *viz.* "that several things which we are said falsely to charge them with, are maintained and defended by them." This indeed the character which he made, little more than in jest, for his zealous brother, doth seem more directly to oppose. And yet it might be easily answered, that his brother, in his zeal, might urge what was

false against us, though we urged nothing but what was true against the Papists. Which, with a great deal more, the Answerer offered to the consideration of the Representer; and he is now told that he passed over this same charge upon the Church of England with a light touch, &c. And much ado there is, because he was "not for pursuing every new game, but for keeping to the old scent."* For what could possibly come more cross to the Representer than that, after all his doubling and shifting, he should start new game for us, and yet we should be for "keeping to the old scent?" And therefore I do not wonder to hear him complaining in this manner, "And is it possible then that the disputing humour is so soon off? We have heard of nothing hitherto so much as of disputes—and yet the Answerer is as unwilling to dispute as the Representer—here is not a word of disputing—and is it not strange that he should draw me out to dispute—and when his own turn comes of disputing, he should let the matter fall, because, forsooth, he will keep to his old scent?"

Now really this would almost persuade a man to let him go for good and all; as he might have done if he had observed but a little moderation. But he gives it out, that in his brother's character of the Church of England, "almost every point is urged with the same proofs of Scripture and reason, which Protestants produce against the Papists: that there is scarce an argument in the character, but is exactly parallel to what the Church of England uses in her defence against Popery; that the grounds of the arguments are the same, the manner of urging them the same, the maxims on which they stand the same, and then the reasons which press them home, are they not the very same which the Answerer himself, in his former discourse, urges against him?" And he turns it upon his Answerer, that "a little prudence would serve him to say nothing in such a cause as will admit no better a defence." This I must needs say, is a little too tyrannical in a Representer under his circumstances; and would tempt a man against his own inclination, to follow him a little further now, under his new shape.

I tell him, therefore, in the first place, that a close disputant would have pressed him to shew that the reasons upon which we proceed in our manifold charge against the Papists are false and unsatisfactory; and not have suffered him to run out into

an inquiry, whether the reasons upon which his zealous brother proceeds against us be the same with them or no. Or, if this were to be allowed him, we might be well excused from answering him in this matter, since the particular controversies which the Church of England hath with the Dissenters, have been managed on her behalf, not so long since that it should be forgotten; and the difference of the case between the separation of Protestants from the Church of Rome, and of Dissenters from the Church of England, was shewn after all, and that in very good earnest. For this being not taken notice of by the Representor, it might very well set off our debt to him for a charge upon the Church of England, which himself meant little more than in jest. Besides, although he glories in this charge, more than in all his other performances, yet, since he frequently intimates that he intended no more by it, than to ridicule our charge against the Church of Rome, it is all one as if he had given it under his hand, that his cause is more safe by ridiculing what we say, than by replying to it like a disputant. Now, on the other hand, we think our charge must needs have been carefully laid, and well defended, if at last it will admit of none but ridiculing replies. And so we might without much danger leave things as they are, and put it to the venture, whether the world will not think so too. But because he boasts so very much that this discourse, which he has composed for the brother, is not yet sufficiently answered, and as some think he may grow a little popular by it, I care not if I go on with him in some part of his own way; and, in compliance with the opinion of others, inquire into the difference of those objections upon which we proceed against the Church of Rome, from those upon which his zealous brother proceeds against the Church of England.

1. I grant that our prelates have revenues, and I believe coaches, mitres, crosiers, and copes. Now if there be any reason why his brother calls these Popish, it is this, that these things were not in use in "our Saviour's and in the Apostles' times." But when did we ever object against any thing that is merely circumstantial amongst them (as these things are), that it was not used in our Saviour's, or in his Apostles' times? Have we not said it a thousand times, that we like nothing the worse because the Papists approve it, provided it be useful; nay, if it be innocent and harmless? As for their ornaments and ceremonies, where does any one find that in the controversies now on foot betwixt us, we do at all insist upon

them? though we cannot but think many of them to be neither grave nor decent, their number too great, and too much religion placed in them by some people. So that, though "there is scarce an argument in the character, but exactly parallel to what we use," and though "ALMOST EVERY POINT is urged with the same proofs," &c. yet surely the first point is none of them. And therefore let us try the next.

2. It is objected against us, that "we make gods of dead men," and this is proved by the weekly bills of mortality, where our churches are called by the same titles that they had in times of Popery. Now if by "making gods of dead men," be meant making the saints so many independent deities, there is then a great deal of difference between what the zealous brother objects against us, and what we object against the Papists, as well as between the reasons of our objections: for we never object this against them. But if by this expression be meant, giving that worship to the saints, which belongs only to God and our Saviour; we then allow our objection to be the same, but do think that we have much better reasons to object this against the Papist, than that of a "weekly bill of mortality." For we appeal to the public addresses which are made to the Virgin Mary, and other saints, with all the circumstances of external adoration; to their Litanies and to the hymns of their established offices, wherein they are often invoked after the same manner as God himself is; to their appropriating to particular saints, distinct powers of doing good to their worshippers; to their acknowledgment, that the saints are mediators of intercession; to the prayers that are made to them in all places, as if they were omnipresent; to the sense also of their Council of Trent, that they are to be prayed unto with mental as well as vocal prayer, as if they knew our hearts. All which I hope is something more than that in the weekly bill of mortality, and in common conversation, we call our temples by the same names they formerly had. And yet the Representer asks, "Wherein have I ridiculed the Church of England? I have done no more in my character against her, than what they have been doing these hundred and fifty years against the Church of Rome." So that it seems we have for these hundred and fifty years charged them with worshipping the saints upon no better grounds than their weekly bills of mortality. "Only," saith he, "what I have done in a kind of jest, and without endeavouring to delude any body with such kind of sophistry, they

have been doing in the greatest earnest, and by it making good their cause." So that he confesses his charge upon our Church to be carried on with a kind of sophistry: only what he has done in a kind of jest, we have been doing against them in the greatest earnest; *i. e.* we have in good earnest charged the Church of Rome with giving that worship to saints which belongs to God only, upon nothing else but the titles of churches, such as ours have in the bills of mortality. But surely his greatest sophistry of all lies in this, that he endeavours to delude people into this opinion, which yet if he could, he must delude them into another opinion too, that Bellarmine and all the famous champions of old Popery, were a company of fools, to be at so much sweat and charges to maintain the worship of saints, and to defend it, as they have done, when they could so easily have denied it. For that nothing is easier than to make good our disowning it against the ground upon which he charges us with it, I shall presently make appear.

To let pass his suggestion, that the "London churches were first built by the Papists;" his adding that we "rebuilt them, with the same titles, invocations and dedications which they use," shews how little he is to be trusted in a question of antiquity, who talks so carelessly of things that are notorious in our own days. Our fathers indeed found the titles convenient enough, and the churches themselves reasonable good churches, and retained them both. But when we raised them out of their ashes, we dedicated them to no saint, whatever has been done in this kind formerly; nor have we since invoked any saint in any one of them, but we keep the titles still. And does our new Representer expect that we should answer such objections as these? At least I desire him not to think that we will make a practice of it. Must our retaining these titles, necessarily infer a virtual dedication of our temples to those saints, by whose names they are distinguished from one another? But what if we had called them by the names of those streets only where they stand, had they then been dedicated to the honour of the streets? We say that the hundred thirty and two churches here, which are known by the names of dead men and women, are with us God's houses, and dedicated to his only service, no less than the five that are distinguished by the names of Christ and the Trinity. And methinks so acute a disputant as he has grown, might have seen that the title of one church distinguishing it from the rest, does not shew who is served and worshipped there, when

the same service and worship is used in all of them. That which we blame them for is, that they continue to worship dead men and women in those churches which bear their names, and in those which do not. For if in Christ's church they call upon the blessed Virgin; though the church has its title from Christ, yet it is a house of prayer to her as well as to him. And if in the churches which are known by her name, we call upon God only, and worship him alone, they are his houses entirely, and none of hers. But after all, where does the Answerer press him with the titles of their churches? "And yet the reasons which press home the arguments, are they not the very same which the Answerer himself urges against him the Representer?"

3. I confess that I have seen pictures in some English Bibles and Common Prayer Books, and Moses and Aaron painted on each side of the Commandments upon some of our altar-pieces; which things how they have crept in amongst us I cannot tell, for they have no public authority from our Church. The Answerer made his guess, and perhaps it will not be easy to mend it. But upon this great occasion, the Representer has brought in his rigid brother making us worse than the Papists themselves, forgetting that he undertook to represent us not altogether so bad, and therefore he should at least have corrected himself in this manner: "Indeed, beloved, I told ye at first, that these Church-of-England men are within the 'swing of the dragon's tail;' but I had not lied to say that they are under the feet and the belly, more than the Papists themselves are. For the Papists do no more towards the placing of image-worship in the word of God, than by a cleanly conveyance of that commandment which forbids it, out of the way. But these Church-of-England men, as they are called, have given that abomination of images themselves a place in every leaf of their Bible, in the very word of God; which is the greatest argument of sovereign honour. Nay, in some of their Bibles you shall find Moses and Aaron stand in the very next leaf to the Ten Commandments; which what is it, beloved, but a defiance to the second? Whereas the Papists being more modest than to affront it, have put it away far from them. But this is not all, my brethren, for they pray to their pictures; for if you but look over their shoulders, you will see their pictures in the very heat of their devotion, under their very eyes, in the leaves of their Common-Prayer Books; and therefore, mark me now, beloved, if we must believe our own

senses, they pray to the pictures, and to the leaves, and to the idol Common-Prayer Books and all."

This indeed had been something like, and would have pieced well with what follows, that our "altars have their images too, and that in a more profane way than the Papists," &c.

Well; but let us suppose our Church bound to answer for these pictures, and for Moses and Aaron, &c. Are we enjoined to pay them any worship, as they of the Romish communion are obliged to pay to their images? The Council of Trent has determined "that due honour and veneration must be given to images, and that the honour which is given to them is referred to the things which they represent." Has the Church of England done any thing like this? We read of several prayers used at the consecration of images among them: but whoever heard of any such thing practised at the setting up of Moses and Aaron? We know that they walk many miles in pilgrimage to particular images, and that they think much more good is to be expected from some, than from others: but whoever thought so among us, or imagined that the pictures of Moses and Aaron in Cornhill, were more to be honoured than those in Wood Street, or in any other place? So that how silly soever the zealous brother may appear to be in imputing to us, upon such frivolous grounds, the worship of images, I am sure that he who made the harangue for him, is either much more so, or something that is worse, in pretending that when we urge the same against the Papists, the reasons we go upon are no better than his.

But we do at least make images and pictures, which the "second commandment expressly forbids," as he makes his brother say. And now a reason of the Answerer is produced, that "no intention can alter the nature of actions which are determined by a divine law." I would therefore know of him, whether there be, or be not good reason to make us certain, that the second commandment does not absolutely forbid the making of images and pictures, but only with reference to worshipping them. If there be no good reason for it, let him then tell me, whether any intention can justify the making of images against an absolute law to the contrary. If there be, let him then but confess what he thinks of this objection that he has put into his brother's mouth, and there is one labour saved.

I confess, it were not ill for him if some intention might justify the breaking of the ninth commandment; for he pretends

that the new Common Prayer Books do not profess that hatred to image-worship which the old ones did; when in the Communion to which he refers, the very first instance runs thus: "Cursed is the man that maketh any carved or molten image to worship it." Does he think that his dissenting brother must answer for these things?

4. Neither is he more just to us in making his zealous brother to object against us, "that we worship saints and angels;" for to pass by the argument about erecting temples to them, to which we have already spoken, is our giving thanks to God upon set days for such eminent examples of faith and virtue, as the first propagators of the Gospel were? Is our commemorating their patience, and all their other divine graces, to excite one another to the imitation of them? Is our praying to God that we may be the followers of them, who through faith and patience inherit the promises? Is this, I say, anything like to what the Council of Trent declares, "that they think wickedly who deny that saints are to be invoked?" Is it of the same nature with owning them to be mediators of intercession, the same with putting up to them that sort of petitions which are fit to be offered to God only? Or does our praying upon St. Michael's day, that by "God's appointment his holy angels may succour and defend us," come near even so much as to one single "Holy Michael, pray for us?" which form of words, though much inferior to what is sometimes used in the Church of Rome, we never dare to venture upon, because we cannot make addresses either to him, or to any other angel or saint, but by interpretation we must ascribe the divine attribute of omnipresence to them, and for many other reasons, which yet we have not been able to get an answer to from these men. But he says, "that we pray on St. Michael's day, as if God were not able to defend us, and therefore we seek shelter under the angels' wings:" and this surely is to worship angels. By like reason if we pray for our daily bread, we pray as if God were not able to preserve us without it: and this would be to worship bread. The Representer makes too bold with his zealous brother, and with us too, if he would have it thought that we reason against them at this rate. But by this time I hope he sees to how little purpose he applies that of the Answerer to this matter, *viz.* that "all worship of invisible beings is religious worship," &c. For as yet he has not proved that we worship saints or angels; and if he has done his best towards it here, I will be bold to say, that he knows he cannot prove it

against us, as we can against them, if there were any need of it : but there is no need of it, because they confess it.

5. As for what is objected about our idolatry in receiving the sacrament, if I did not know the prompter, I should be ashamed to find it amongst such instances as are said to be built upon the same maxims that our objections against the Papists are. For how far soever we and the zealous brother might in other cases be said to agree in the reasons of what we object, I am sure it is most unreasonable to say we agree in this. For do we, as the Papists, hold that the bread and wine are changed into the natural body and blood of Christ ? Do we require any worship to be paid to the elements after consecration ? Do we elevate or carry them about on purpose to have them adored by the people ? Nay, with reference to our receiving the same in the posture of kneeling, is it not as fully as can be declared, "that that posture is meant for a signification of our humble and grateful acknowledgment of the benefits of Christ to all worthy receivers ; that no adoration is hereby intended, for that the sacramental bread and wine remain still in their very natural substances, and the natural body and blood of our Saviour are in heaven and not here ?" Which declaration is the more significant, one would think, as being made by our Church in opposition to those who do adore the sacrament : especially since it was not the posture of kneeling when the sacrament is received which of itself could make such a declaration needful, but the scandal which they give to the world who adore it. Had this been considered by the Representer, his brother's zeal might well have been spared in saying, "They may say, they do not pay religious worship to the bread and wine, and honour the sacrament as God : but what ! must we not believe our senses in so plain a case ?" Or else his zeal should not have stopped here, but carried him a little farther, to appeal to his own eyes, that we honour the paten and chalice as gods too, by falling down to them on our knees, for this is as plain a case as the other ; and our Church has made no declaration against it in solemn and particular terms neither, as it has against the adoration of the bread and the wine. But I guess that the zealous brother, when he is once at liberty to speak for himself, will confess that he sees neither the one nor the other ; and that it is no affront to his eyes to acquit us of adoring the sacrament, and to yield that when we receive it, we adore God and him only, in a posture which, as we think, well becomes the thankful receivers of such holy mysteries.

However, though we, it seems, must not be believed when we say that we do not adore the sacrament at all, yet we will not be so hard to the Church of Rome, but believe her telling us that she does adore the sacrament, and that with divine honour too. And when the zealous brother gets our Church at any advantage like this, or can find out any practices amongst us like those above mentioned, we shall hear him, I doubt not, speaking to better purpose for himself than as his brother here has taught him.

And now, I think, I have omitted nothing in the first five of the fifteen parallels that required the least notice, but have rather ventured being laughed at by the Representer for giving any serious answers where he meant only to ridicule. But by this he may see what little reason there was to crow over his adversary as he does upon this occasion, which was all that I intended. And therefore since it is needless to drive the parallel any farther with that circumstance which I have hitherto used, I must not do a needless thing, which, according to one of his weighty observations, "would be sixpence a-piece more for the curious;" especially since the Answerer has done reason enough to the remaining particulars. For though the Representer, to save himself from any further reply, comes off with telling him that he answered the whole charge with, "the Dissenters never charged us with this or that," &c. and nothing else, yet the reader will find more said than this comes to, if he will consult the answer itself instead of taking the Representer's word. But I hope five of his particulars have been handled his own way; and now I offer him this, either in full satisfaction, or in part of payment; let him choose as he likes, it is all one to his humble servant. And therefore if he will please to call upon me for arrears, I promise him that our "calling upon the birds, the beasts, and the fishes," shall not be forgotten; nor "our crying out to dead men in our most solemn devotion," nor the Apocrypha in the Liturgy, nor the rochet, the alb, and the tunicle, nor anything else which yet wants a vindication, as he says: but, to return him one of his familiar phrases, I shall take occasion of playing him the same tune over again as distinctly upon the remaining ten, as he has had it already upon his first five particulars.

And now let us go on with his Reply, in which the next thing I observe is, that he will needs have the Answerer to "bid fair for the good opinion of Dissenters," and "to curry closely with the Dissenters," and to "throw those scandals upon his

own Church in good earnest, which the Representer did little more than in jest.”* If the Representer could have turned his adversary's pen against the Dissenters, there are some would have had a better opportunity of currying closely with the Dissenters; and I shall tell him who they are before I have done with him. But it seems we are not for doing every good thing in the very nick when he would have done it; and so to be revenged on us, we must be represented as currying with the Dissenters, which yet we are as far from, when we own our agreement with them in those many things which they, no less than we, object against the Papists, as from currying with the Papists, when we confess that we agree with them in those fewer things that are to be objected against the Dissenters. And yet currying with the Dissenters is not so great a fault, but he could tell them upon the spot, how their sufferings are at an end, now our Church's power has been something checked,† which he thinks they may reflect upon. But if the Representer would win their good opinion, he should of all things beware of putting them in mind to reflect, lest when they begin to reflect upon those things of which he speaks, they should chance to reflect upon other things of which he speaks not.

Methinks, too, I may reasonably suspect a little currying of the Representer in what comes next. For, whereas the Answerer thought the Dissenters “too wise and cautious to take characters (of us) from (their own) open and professed enemies” (for that was his plain meaning), the Representer understands him as if he had meant our, *i. e.* the Church of England's professed enemies:‡ and then hopes that our people will henceforth be so wise as not to take characters of Popery from us who are, as he says, enemies to Papists. But whether he was resolved to make this mistake for the sake of the neat turn, or to save himself from saying whether he was friend or enemy to the Dissenters, I leave him to resolve; but I hope he does not expect that I should take notice of every such little reflection, as he knows this to be.

And yet I must needs vindicate the Answerer from that charge, that whereas the Representer granted, that his Protestant character of a Papist was not made up wholly of downright lies, the Answerer stretches this courtesy with a witness,§ and concludes that we have the Representer's words for it now that we are guilty of no misrepresentation at all of matters of

* P. 5.

† P. 5.

‡ P. 6.

§ P. 9.

fact,* which he, the Representer, never did nor will allow. But in this the Answerer is wronged, who very well remembered that his adversary did a little dispute his Church's owning the deposing power, and two or three points more, which he thought fit to drop at last. Now, therefore, as the Answerer had frequently said before, that the matters of fact were the same in both characters, very few things excepted; so in his last answer he was to be understood in course with the same exception, *viz.* that we now had our adversary's confession, that in the character of a misrepresented Papist, there were no Protestant misrepresentations of Popery properly so called; and so, that a very few points excepted, we are agreed on both sides upon the matters of fact. And this one would think was plain enough in the last answer, where the Answerer thus interprets the concession of his adversary: "Whatever he at first pretended, he grants now, that we are not in a strict and proper sense misrepresenters; and thus farewell to character-making, since Papists and Protestants that understand these matters, are in the main (not absolutely in every point, but in the main) agreed what is the character of a Papist, though they differ in their opinion about him," &c.†

I know indeed the Representer would extend the downright lies, from which he does not absolutely acquit us, to more instances than those excepted by the Answerer. For which he appeals to his own character of a Papist misrepresented,‡ where he has represented the Protestants as liars, in charging the Papists with other things disowned by the Church of Rome: which is one of the finest fetches that is possible. For though in that character, he has made the Protestant to charge the Papist with all that we indeed charge them with; yet he has made him do more, and therefore might safely appeal to his own character, to prove that we are liars in some things; always supposing that he is the honestest man in the world, in representing the Protestant representations of Popery. But how often must he be told, that he has been a false representer of us as to this matter? that he sometimes brings in Protestants charging Papists, 1. In ambiguous terms, which admit of different interpretations; for instance, under the head of "praying to images," which is the first point he mentions. 2. With owning the dangerous consequences of their doctrines and practices, as that "Papists believe their sins infallibly

* P. 10.

† Answ. to Am. Accom. p. 8, 9.

‡ P. 11.

remitted upon absolution, whether they resolve upon amendment or no ;” which is his second instance, and there are two or three more, to the same tune. 3. With some things that we do not impute to them at all, either as principles or consequences ; witness that instance which he has the forehead still to insist upon. “For,” says he, “are their sermons in Latin ? Do they teach in unknown tongues ?” as if we charged them with this. I know not what every Protestant in the world may have said in his heat against Papists : but I am apt to think that it will be as hard to find a Protestant that hath said this against them, as to find a zealous brother that will own the canting sermon he hath made against us. Upon one or other of these three accounts he might well appeal to his own characters to convict us of lying, and ask the Answerer what he thinks of this or that which Protestants charge upon Papists ; supposing, as I said before, that he delivers oracles always when he is setting us out to the world.

And now, I say, it is too late for the Representor to ask us, what we think of these things ; because not to mention the second answer, his first Answerer has told him very particularly what we think of them, what we do charge them with, and what not. And since he has said nothing to it, it is unreasonable to expect that we should do the same thing over and over again, as often as he is pleased to put the question to us. As for firing the city, and killing Sir Edmundbury Godfrey, &c. what have these things to do in the character of Popery ? I suppose it is no article of the Representor's faith, that Papists did not these things ; I am sure it is none of mine, that they did.

Having upon no better grounds than these accused the Answerer of misrepresenting him, he runs out into general and passionate expostulations concerning the injustice of those who for their own interest support the false notions which the people have of Popery, lest themselves should appear deceivers. At length he asks, whether although “the people must be preached into a dread of Popery, it be a Christian method to make use of artifices to increase the horror ?” Why should every thing the Papists do be stretched and strained, and forced to make it ugly ?—It is true, this is proper enough to win upon the mobile, who make no distinction between real and artificial monsters ; it is well enough, where the interest

is best maintained by the madness of the people. But where is the Christianity all this while, where is truth and charity?" Why, truly, not so much as there should be, where either these things are done on the one side, or falsely said to be done on the other. Now it must not be quite forgotten that the Representer wrote his Protestant characters of Popery, as they lay in his own and the people's heads; and made all his Answerer's work in distinguishing between representation and dispute; between principles that are owned, and consequences that are denied by the Papists, utterly useless; because things did not and could not lie thus distinctly in the people's heads. For instance, because if a preacher should say, that though the Papists think it lawful to worship images, yet it is plainly forbidden in God's word so to do, and that too as an idolatrous action; the poor people presently conclude, that the Papists believing it to be idolatry, differ from us in no other thing, but that we think idolatry and forbidden worship to be unlawful, and the Papists do not think so. But if the Representer believed this of the people, "where was Christianity, where was truth and charity," when he wrote his representation of Popery, under colour of disabusing the people; and made one part of a Papist's character to be this, that he abhors idolatry! for thus the people would be betrayed into a belief, that he does not so much as worship images; for consequents and antecedents are so jumbled in the people's heads, that nothing can lie distinctly there. We indeed do not think so meanly of them, and therefore might honestly urge arguments and consequences against that and other practices of the Roman Church. But he, it seems, believed they could not distinguish between the one and the other; and then I am sure if they acquitted Papists of the consequence, it will go hard if they did not acquit them of the fact too, and therefore whether he put the denying of the consequence into the Papists' character with an honest design, at least, whether he had any reason to object against the distinct proceeding of the Answerer, I dare almost now appeal to himself. But, as I observed before, the Answerer made him ashamed of imputing this kind of madness to the people, and so we heard no more of it in his next reply. But yet the interest we are said to have in the people, must still be imputed to their madness. And what madness is it now? Why, they cannot distinguish between real and artificial monsters: which is as much as to say, that we have made the Papists monsters, by telling notorious lies of them; and the

people are so mad that they cannot find it out. But may not I take my turn now to ask, "where is Christianity all this while; where is truth and charity?" Why must we be branded with the imputation of falsehood and calumny, and our Christian brethren treated in that manner, as if they were mere stupid creatures, and more fit to herd with beasts than to live amongst men?

As for ourselves being thus urged, we beg leave to appeal to all that know us, whether this odious character be any way suitable to our conversation; and then, whether we have deserved it for the management of this controversy in particular, we appeal to the world. We appeal to all men of sincerity and understanding, what colour of reason the Representor had here to ask, "Why praying to images, leave to sin for money, forgiveness without repentance, &c. should be urged against them to make them the object of hatred, and the subject of popular fury?" Have not his Answerers more than once published clearly and distinctly what we do, and what we do not charge them with, in every one of these respects? Has he convinced them of any insincerity, nay, of any mistake in the stating of these things? Has he taken notice of any thing they have said about them? Why would he not be brought to confess the justice of our charging them so as we have done, and our justice to them in charging them no farther, or at least to confute us by shewing wherein we had done unjustly? What other construction now can truth and charity make of these proceedings, but that he would not confess that we do them no wrong, and yet could not prove that we do? But then certainly he should at least have been silent, and not go on as he does to declaim against us; as if he really believed we were those odious misrepresenters and falsifiers, which he would have the world believe that we are.

He says indeed, that the Answerer "unhappily takes it to himself, as if he and his were arraigned of lying and calumny, &c. whereas the Representor spoke only in general, without so much as hinting upon any party or person in particular." But surely when after the first answer that was made in behalf of the Church of England, the Representor, without telling us the particulars why, could yet declare that he would "be a Turk as soon as a Papist, if the Answerer had rightly represented Popery;" we must have as little understanding, as he allows to the mobile, not to find that we are principally intended in these general declamations. He thinks the Answerer's

over-solicitude to prove his innocence, may in some breed a suspicion of his guilt. But whether it be innocence or guilt that makes us solicitous to clear ourselves, we may now leave the world to judge. One thing, I take it, is easy to be discerned, that though our adversary rolls in figures to heighten the injustice under which *he* and *his* have suffered by misrepresentations, yet he throws the guilt so faintly upon the Church of England, as if he were conscious of being unjust to us all the while.

As for the people of our communion, whom he compliments under the title of the *mobile*, we may say without vanity, that how scornfully soever the Representer treats them, we shall never be ashamed to compare them with their neighbours; and that it would be a better world for the Representer, if they were as ignorant and stupid as he would have them thought to be.

But no more of what he has said in this fit of anger; for here is a sudden change, and now behold him the gayest and merriest man alive. He fancies the Answerer left him to wonder who those *we* are that are not misrepresenters in a strict and proper notion of misrepresenting, *i. e.* who do not belie the Papists. For indeed he "would gladly know who those *we* are, that he might return them his thanks for this so kind office.—Did he but know the men, he would never permit them to lie obscured under the general name of *we*. No, he would particularize them to the world.—For why? are not such men prodigies of truth, honesty, and justice?—Men that never misrepresented the Papists! Why, these are admirable men indeed, and not to be heard of every day!" Now really this, with all that belongs to it, is allowed to be very well for that kind, and so much the better, because it more and more appears, that though he can be angry without a cause, yet a small matter will please him again. For he is delighted beyond measure with wondering who these *we* are, and wishes there be no mistake in it, and makes it hard to imagine who they should be: but I will warrant him he has them presently, as hard as it is. For in the very next place he tries whether the Answerer by his *we*, should mean *we* Protestants. And that is a pretty near guess for the first. But then, alas! who can believe it, that *we* Protestants should be no misrepresenters? He, for his part, would willingly give something for the sight of the man that thinks so, who would be the greatest misrepresenter of all, in vouching for the truth of all that has

been invented against the Papists these hundred and forty years. Why then, surely, they are not *we* Protestants. But for all that, upon consideration, he thinks he may take it for granted that they are *we* Protestants. For the Answerer vindicates Protestants, and for himself, "one may swear he is a staunch true Protestant, as never scrupling for any thing that is for running down the Papists, though it be currying favour with and colloquing the fanatics." And thus the Answerer coming cross in his way, his fit takes him again; for he cannot abide the Answerer, and so there is an end of his mirth: and now in sober sadness we must suppose that the Answerer's *we*, are *we* Protestants. For which reason the Representer begins the world again, and is resolved to prove out of the sermons and books of Protestants, that *we* Protestants are misrepresenters: and so he falls to work about it in good earnest through the remaining part of his book. Now I am so far from being angry with him for this, that I rather wish some merry youth were to take him up here, to requite his railery, and keep up the good humour a little longer. And if it should come into any body's head hereafter, who is given that way, to lay the pleasant and the angry Representer together, as it might be done, the jest would go rarely forward, and that to somebody's cost too, that may be thinks little of it.

For, was it not the Representer that would be glad to know who these men are that do misrepresent Papists, "these admirable men are not to be heard of every day;" these men, that "were he but assured of the being of such men, he should begin to think Astrea was returned again!" Did he not wish to know them, that he might "particularize them to the world, nay, and have their names blazoned in every street upon pillars erected to their memory?" Yes, surely, this was the Representer himself. Why then, dear Sir, be happy and joyful, for many such admirable men, as these, are in being I assure you, and to be heard of every day; but because it will be too great a charge to erect pillars for them all, I shall at present recommend but two of them to your acquaintance, who are already particularized to the world, by the names of the first and second Answerers to "a Papist misrepresented and represented." What pity is it that such friends should be obscured so long under the general name of *we*, and be no better known to one another? These, Sir, are the men whom you desire to honour, as if they were made on purpose for it. For why? Though very honest gentlemen they are, and their words may go for as great a

matter, yet they have a notable quality besides, never to think of representing the Church of Rome, without proving what they say. Why, Sir, they have been lately tried upon no less than thirty and seven points of Popery; and have borne the test of a severe, watchful, double-dealing adversary; and one as vehemently desirous to find false representers among Protestants, as you can be to know the true ones. Now, Sir, judge if these two are not likely to prove right and true men: for the adversary is to this day roaming up and down amongst other men's books to get Protestant misrepresentations for them to answer; a plain sign, you will say, that he has found none of their own to call them to an account for. And so having found out your admirable men for you, I wish you much joy of one another.

Now this is too blunt, I confess, to go for raillery; but it is true though, and that is almost as good: and the Representer may see by it how another would have handled him upon this matter, if he had not by good fortune fallen in my way. It is to me a most unaccountable thing, why the Representer should search for more and more misrepresentations, misquotations, and such like faults in Protestant authors, and forsake the defence of his own double characters, if indeed he thinks they may be defended: but if he does not think so, it were but an honest man's part to confess it, and then I think the controversy were at an end. Certainly the design of his first book, which he still pretends to vindicate, was to give us an account of the doctrines and practices of the Church of Rome, upon which score he took upon himself the title of a Representer. It is true he pretended to dispute for them too; but that design fell to the ground upon the first attempt that was made upon him, and I believe he will hardly stoop to take it up again. But then to illustrate the representing part, he shewed on the other side how Protestants, as he says, have misrepresented Papists. So that here was a solemn controversy begun upon so many several points, about representing and misrepresenting; and it was, one would think, very fairly carried on by the first Answerer, who we know went on with the Representer from point to point, discovering where need was his ambiguities and fallacies on both sides, mending his characters, and giving a correct and plain account of the doctrines and practices of the Church of Rome, in opposition to that lame and deceitful account thereof, which the Representer had published. The sum of the performance was to shew how much and no

more we absolutely charge upon the Church of Rome, and in matters of charge not so clear as the rest, how far and no farther we accuse them ; every particular being guarded with reasonable proofs and testimonies. The second Answerer, perceiving into what mistakes the Representer was wandering, by confounding the proper subject of representation with subjects of dispute, went as particularly through all the points, and plainly distinguished those things under every one. Now would not any man of common sense imagine, that, if the dispute were pertinently carried on, the question must be this, who gave the truest account of the faith and worship of the Church of Rome, the Representer, or the Answerer ? And if it were pertinently managed, that this question must be driven through all the thirty-seven points, as it has been done once and again on our behalf. And therefore to what end the Representer should trouble himself to find out new representations in the books of other Protestants, a man may well wonder for a while, though at last he will settle upon the true reason, that the Representer was sick of defending his own.

If it be said, that one part of his business at least goes forwards still, which was to shew, that some Protestants have been misrepresenters ; I desire it may be considered too, whether this was not in order to the settling of a clear and indisputable account between us, what are, and what are not the doctrines and practices of the Church of Rome, as to the thirty-seven points. For granting now (and it is a good large grant to be made at once), that the Representer did sincerely give in his own former Protestant thoughts of Popery, and (as far as he could understand them) those apprehensions what Popery is which lay in the heads of the vulgar ; then so far as the Answerers confessed this was not a true representation, if Protestants did thus charge the Church of Rome, so far I say they complied with the Representer's design, which was to correct such, if there were any such mistakes going amongst Protestants. But so far as they owned the charge in the Protestant character to be good against the Church of Rome, if the Representer disowned it, he had in this case nothing to do but to confute their testimonies, and to shew that in those particulars as well as in others, his Church was misrepresented. And therefore if he had been sincere, the controversy had proceeded thus on his side ; and nothing could have diverted him from proceeding in this manner, if he had been able to make any thing of it. But instead of this, he has for some time

forsaken his thirty and seven chapters, and employed himself in turning over some books of Protestants, to find out such sayings as he thinks there is any colour to call misrepresentations; nay, he is fallen so low as to pick out what misquotations of authors he can find amongst them, and to tax them here and there for historical passages.

But did ever either of his adversaries undertake to justify all that any Protestant divine or historian has at any time said in opposition to Popery? Or, was it not possible to give a more honest account of Popery than he did, to discover his fallacious way of representing his own Church, and the true state of the questions that have been hitherto disputed, without such an undertaking? Nay, have not his Answerers effectually done it, without any such undertaking? so effectually, that he has forsaken the defence of his double characters under the thirty-seven points? Why then must they be bound to answer for all that every Protestant has said against the Church of Rome? Will he answer for all the Popish misrepresentations of Protestants, that I can bring before him? I shall try him a little as to this before I have done: and I think with some better grace, than this task has been put upon us withal. For if it be but a mean way of carrying on the controversy, as I confess it is, yet he has forced us to it by insisting upon it so obstinately, that we have now no other way to let him see the inconvenience of it, but by turning it upon himself. And, which is something too, we have cleared our hands of him as to the original controversy, for he has dropped that quite away, and so having no arrears to be reproached with, we may handsomely enough talk with him upon this new score; and I will venture beforehand to say thus much, that he is likely to be as deep in our debt for this, as he is for his first dealings with us. Nor am I afraid thus to speak my belief in this matter, though he seems to have taken up a way of writing now, that will not fail him in haste; for as long as he can but find out any new severe sayings of Protestants against Popery, it is but furnishing out a new book with them, and he may as well call it by the title of a fifth or a sixth vindication of himself, as by any other title whatsoever. Nay, the vindication will go forward, if it can but find out a vulgar head without a name, to say that he believes the Popish sermons are in an unknown tongue, or any other thing as extravagant as that.

But though it be no part of our business to bring off every thing that has been said or done by Protestants, yet I shall a

little examine what our Representer has charged those with, whom he hath singled out to expose them to the world. For I am much mistaken if even here, he has not exposed himself a great deal more than any body else : since he does often take the liberty to fill up his tragical declamations against Protestants, by spiteful constructions, weak inferences, and now and then by false accusations, which is never more intolerable, than when a man is in the same breath exclaiming against the misrepresentations of others. For my own part, where his accusations in whole or in part fall justly, there shall they lie for me, nor will I make another man's fault my own by going about to defend it. And if he had taken the same care not to make himself guilty by accusing the innocent, he had come off better upon this theme of arraigning particular men, as wild as it is.

He begins first with Sutcliff's inference from Aquinas, which I confess is a very silly one ; though I think it had been not only for Sutcliff's credit that this matter had been let alone, but for Aquinas's too, whose principle is no very wise one. But I see no reason why the Answerer should have been ashamed to print it over again, since he did it only to shew that Sutcliff inferred his accusation by consequence from what an author of their own had said, but not to justify the inference. And for any thing the Answerer has said, the Representer is at liberty to go on with his charge of ignorance or malice against him that drew the consequence, to call him a fool in this business, if he believed the consequence to be good, or a knave if he did not.

But I would gladly know how the Representer can clear himself from gross misrepresentation in the next instance, where falling upon the author of the representing Catechism* for charging them with praying to images, he makes it to be a crime, which his first Answerer had cleared them from, in saying, that we do not charge them with praying to images without any farther respect. For may not a man pray to images, and yet not pray to them without any farther respect ? This would make one believe that he writes only for the mobile, in whose heads things cannot lie distinctly. But it is not so honest though, especially in a man that complains of misrepresentations. But by this time, I hope, he is made sensible of his miscarriage here, by what the author of that Cate

* Page 19.

chism has done to justify his charge. And so I pass over this complaint, and come to the next.

Which is of a sermon that charges them with praying to relics too. Now whether the preacher had any particular testimonies that there are some amongst them, who do not only worship, but likewise call upon Martin's boots,* &c. I know not, and therefore cannot at present pass sentence against him; especially since I am well assured that the Council of Trent condemns those in general, "who affirm that the memories of the saints are in vain frequented, for the obtaining of help from their relics, and other their sacred monuments,"† or remains. Now if Martin's boots and Joseph's breeches, &c. are the relics of saints, then they are not only to be venerated, as the Council affirms, but the memories where they are must be frequented also, for obtaining help from them. This I think is no misrepresentation, no wry interpretation, no imputation upon them from ignorance or malice in drawing the consequence.

In the next place the Answerer of "Catholics no Idolaters," is made a misrepresenter for saying, that the common answer of Catholics, that their adoration of the eucharist cannot be idolatry, is, because they "believe the bread to be God, just as the worshippers of the sun believe the sun to be God: whereas the Catholics do not believe the bread to be God," &c.‡ To which I say, it is so notoriously known that Papists believe (as they tell us) the bread to be transubstantiated, that if the Answerer's words be as they are here set down, it is yet a mere cavil to pretend that he would insinuate as if the Papists believed that which they adore to be bread, as we believe it is no more. And the argument is good thus, if their mistake who believed the sun to be God did not excuse their worshipping the sun from being idolatry; neither will their mistake, who believe what they worship to be bread no longer but God, excuse them, if it be bread still. But I suspect the words are more clear and full in the Answerer, at least I make no doubt that they are sufficiently secured from the Representer's interpretation of them by other passages in connexion. For the Representer has not referred us to the page, where he has picked up this exception; which omission I believe was

* P. 20.

† Concerning the construction of *Eorum opis impetrandæ causa*. Sess. 25. [Labbe, ut supra, vol. 14. p. 895.] See Defence of Exp. of Doctr. of Ch. of Engl. p. 24, 25.

‡ P. 20.

designed, because he has neglected such reference in four or five instances more. But though I have upon this disadvantage given him a particular answer here, yet I do not intend to use him to it. For the employment he has found out for us at present, is not of that weight, that I should be obliged to turn over whole books, and some of them no small ones neither, to find out a single passage that he thinks fit to carp at. And therefore, at present, I will not be concerned with the vindication of those "deductive absurdities, which Dr. Stillingfleet would persuade to be doctrines of the Roman Church:" for the Representer here refers to the general current of his discourse;* and which is yet more unreasonable, has given me a whole book written in confutation of the Doctor to answer. For the like reason, as he has referred the proof of a hundred and fifty lies (without giving one instance) against John Fox's Acts and Monuments, to the Examen of John Fox's Calendar, p. 3. p. 412, so do I too. Thus also the Archbishop of York misquoting St. Thomas and Bellarmine; and old Dr. Willet's proof out of St Bernard that the Pope is Antichrist; and Bishop Taylor's misquotations and corruptions of authors, which some Answerer of his has made to appear, shall with all the rest of this kind, pass off together without any further notice. For still I say, it is too hard an imposition for the Representer in a few lines to oblige us to read over so many books; and which is by no means to be submitted to, unless the fate of the cause depended upon it, which I am not yet convinced it does. And therefore once again, I must desire him to give in his particular exceptions against our authors in their own words, if he thinks fit to go on in this way, and to tell us the particular page or section where such passages are to be found; and then he shall have my judgment in the case: but if he leaves all upon his own and his friend's credit, I shall be so civil as to do so too.

I come now to his charge upon Dr. Tillotson, for abusing Estius; but whether Estius be not more obliged to Dr. Tillotson than to the Representer, I leave it to others to judge, when I have given a particular account of this matter. I do acknowledge that those words cited by the Representer are in Estius; but though I cannot say whether the Doctor minded them or not, yet I believe it will either way appear that the Representer had but little reason to make this an instance of our "endeavouring to prove some folly upon the Papists, out of

* P. 21.

† P. 22, 23, 24.

their own authors, and then bringing in the authors quite contrary to their own sense and words." Estius concludes that the fire which the Apostle speaks of, 1 Cor. iii. 15, is the fire of the day of judgment, which shall prove every man's work, and purge "that which is not already purged." And at length he comes to speak of the purgatory of souls after this life, which seems not only to be supported, but to be overthrown also by this place of the Apostle, since the whole purgation is reserved to the last judgment." To this he answers, that "thus much is manifest against the sectaries, from his interpretation of the place, that in the world to come some sins are to be forgiven, *viz.* theirs who shall be purged and saved by fire. "Nor," says he, "does it follow from the purgatory-fire of the last day, that no purgatory of souls is left before that day, any more than it follows from the purgatory of souls, that there is no purging in this life;" which, allowing for the principles of his Church, is with the rest that follows to this purpose, a good and solid answer to the foresaid objection. And this was the Doctor's ground for saying, that "Estius contends that it cannot be concluded from hence, that there is a purgatory." But then he goes on, "Besides, we must know that as the Scripture often leaves a particular judgment to be understood, under a general judgment, and from the last day in which all shall be judged, will have the day of every one's death to be understood, in which each man is judged by himself; so from the fire that is to go before the face of Christ at the general judgment, and to purge whatsoever at that time remains to be purged, it leaves a certain fire to be understood, in which a particular judgment is exercised for the purging of souls presently after this life." Then come in the words cited by the Representor: "wherefore by this way the punishment of souls in purgatory is well and solidly gathered." But how is it well and solidly gathered this way? Does Estius say the punishment of souls in purgatory is implied in, or that it does any way follow from that general purging which is to be at the day of judgment? No, he says not a word that looks this way; but only that one leaves the other to be understood, that is to say, if a man has a mind so to understand it, but not else. For it is a shame to repeat that, because where the Scripture speaks of a general judgment, it supposes that we must die first; therefore, when it speaks of a general purgatory of men, it leaves a purgatory of souls beforehand to be understood, or "well and solidly

gathered." But the Representor will say, the question is not whether Estius's way of gathering purgatory from this text be good and solid? but whether Estius does contend for no more than that purgatory cannot be overthrown by it, as the Dean pretended. I grant this to be the question, and it shall have an answer, if it has not had it already. Whether the Dean made the same observation that I have made upon this mysterious business, I cannot certainly say, having never spoken with him about it: but I presume he did, because it will clear him from any great matter of blame, in taking no notice of the passage cited by the Representor. The case in short is this; Estius was very clear in this point, that St. Paul does not here speak of a purgatory of souls, but of that fire which is to prove the works of all at the day of judgment. But then he must guard himself as well as he could from the charge of interpreting this place, otherwise than the Latins had interpreted it at Florence; which made it necessary for him to bring in his third question, *An et quomodo probetur*, whether and how it can be proved from this place, that there is a purgatory for souls after this life, in pursuance of which question he says what we have already cited. Now, although in his interpretation of this text, he could own, as he did, with great modesty and good reason, that he did not follow Bellarmine, Lensæus, Vicus, Bonaventure in all things; yet when the name of a Council lay cross to him, no other kind of modesty would serve but some appearance at least of submission to it. And therefore observing that the Latin Fathers thought that purgatory was to be established upon this place, though the Greek Fathers dissented; he also thought it needful to gather it as well and solidly as he could, from this place too. For by that time he had done his best, *proving* was dwindled to *gathering*; and such a way of gathering too, that the premises being considered, I leave it to all impartial men to consider, whether so judicious a man as Estius was, contended for the point; or rather if the modest Estius, in the strait he was in, did not choose to talk beneath himself, in compliance with the Latin Fathers at Florence. So that at last we have here an example of the servitude of ingenuous minds in the Church of Rome; but not "of charging folly upon the Papists out of their own authors." For this was that which the Dean declined the doing of; whereas, if he had said, "Nay, all that Estius contends for from this place is, that it cannot be concluded from hence that there is no purgatory, although

he makes a hard shift to avoid falling foul with the Florentine Council ;" here had been then no colour for accusing him of misquotation, it had also done his business as well ; only this had been to charge folly upon Estius, and upon the Latin Fathers too, which it seems the Dean had no mind to do.

I proceed next to his charge upon the author of "The Devotions of the Church of Rome." And first he accuses him of quoting Escobar for that which he does not say in the place cited ; nay, "there is not one word of it to be found in him there." Now to know whether this be so or not, it is but fair to take the whole passage of that author, for which he refers us to Escobar, and not as it is silyly guelt by the Representor. The passage is this : "They tell us there is a vast number of sins in their own nature venial, which are so very inconsiderable that an infinite number of them altogether, will not deprive a man of the grace and favour of God, or make up one mortal sin ; and for the pardon of which there is no need or occasion for the mercy of God." Now Escobar, in the place cited, Tract. 2. Exam. 1 chap. 4, in answer to that question, N. 15, "Whether many venial sins of themselves, and formally speaking, can make up one mortal sin?" says thus, "No, because innumerable venial sins do not deprive a man of the grace of God." But the Representor will not allow, that there is one word of that passage, at least, to be found there, that "for the pardon of such sins there is no need or occasion for the mercy of God." But I am sure the thing is to be found there ; for he says, N. 1, that a venial sin is that which does not render a man worthy of eternal punishment : and now if innumerable sins of this sort do not of themselves make up one mortal sin, I think it is plain that take them altogether, and there is no occasion for God's mercy in the pardon of them, unless it be mercy to pardon where there is no desert of punishment. It is true, Escobar says that they are worthy of temporal punishment : but our author was not obliged to take any notice of that, because that which he complained of was not, that these doctrines brought men's fortunes, in this world, into danger ; but that by reason of them, "men are in a wonderful danger of being cheated in a matter of so great moment as their eternal salvation." So that although the Representor professes that this doctrine is contrary to their belief, yet, at least, he must confess that it was not contrary to Escobar's ; and therefore that he hath wronged our author in charging him here with misquotation.

The same book says in another place, p. 56 : that " their saying the same things so many times over, in their Jesus Psalter, is not contrived to help and assist attention, &c. but out of pure vanity and ostentation, or as it were to flatter our blessed Saviour, or the saint they pray to." And this the Representer calls "throwing dirt blindfold,"* &c. and such "misrepresenting," that if the "state or civil government" were served so, there would "be a ——— at the end of it." By which, I guess, he would be content that the author were hanged. But one would be willing to know first what he has done to deserve it? Why, saith the Representer, "this is the reason he gives of our devotion." What? that all who use those forms of devotion which the author censures, have no other "end or intention," but pure "vanity and ostentation or flattery?" So indeed the Representer would insinuate: but, as I shall make appear, the author's meaning was, that the repetitions themselves which he spake off, were purely "vain, and do not serve to any good and prudent end:" for which he chiefly blames the contrivers of them, as the words plainly enough shew. But what reason he had to say this, was laid down just before in these words: their manuals of devotion "are so full of tautologies, and vain repetitions, that they must needs come under the censure of our blessed Saviour, Matth. vi. though they use his holy name. For so in the Jesus Psalter, at the end of the Manual of Prayers and Litanies, printed at Paris, in English, A. D. 1682, in a Litany of fifteen petitions, the name *Jesu* is repeated over above one hundred and thirty times: and in the same book, in the Litany of the blessed Virgin, they pray to her by forty several names, being only so many distinct praises of her." Now this the Representer thought fit to suppress, which would have shewn that he did not make vanity, &c. to be the reason of the people's devotion, but that he charged their forms of prayer with vain repetitions. And here the Representer should have shewn, if he were able, that the repetitions mentioned do not fall under our Saviour's prohibition of vain repetitions; that they could be contrived for some "good and prudent end;" that they serve to any thing better than "ostentation or flattery:" here, I say, he should have employed his skill, and told us what are vain repetitions, if these are not. But this was something a harder task, than to take a passage by itself, without that connexion which would have explained it, and to represent the author by

* P. 26.

it as odiously as he could. For, I say it again, he does not make vanity, &c. the reason of their people's devotion, even in using these vain repetitions. But, indeed, he says plainly enough, that they are so contrived for vanity, and ostentation or flattery, that they are not helps, but hindrances to devotion. But, however, does not this author make vanity to be the end and reason of their contrivance, who composed those forms? No, not that neither; for though that expression "out of pure vanity," &c. be, I confess, something obscure, and seems to look that way, yet it was not his meaning, as any body will say is plain beyond all exception, that consults the whole place. For thus begins that particular to which this passage belongs: "Seventhly, Their manuals and books of devotion, which they give their people to read instead of the Scripture, which they forbid to be used, though they may DESIGN THEM AS HELPS, yet I must range them among the hindrances of devotion." By which it is evident, that he meant not to charge even the contrivers of these tautologies, with any design to lead the people to vanity, because he supposes that they might design them as helps, and not hindrances. The book which he carps at, is written with great judgment, and no less modesty; as one may discern by this, that the Representor could not find a more convenient passage for his anger to work upon, than that which we have seen. But we must not forget that he is all this while making good his title of a Representor.

And now the Bishop of Kilmore is called to account for misrepresenting the Papists, by "putting them upon the same file with infidels and Pagans." For, as Delphos worshipped Apollo, &c.: so, in Popery,* England worshipped St. George, &c. And as the Pagans had their gods for the several elements, for cattle and fruit, for several professions, and several diseases to pray to: "so, in Popery they have one saint for the fire," &c. Now if this be misrepresenting at all, it is misrepresenting with a witness, *i. e.* in the Answerer's phrase, it is misrepresenting in a strict and proper sense, and in the Representor's phrase, "downright lying." For I do not find that the Bishop affirms any thing in all this, but matter of fact. But will the Representor say that Papists have not tutelar saints for several countries, and several saints to pray to, for their cattle and the fruits of the earth? Is it true or false that St. Roch is prayed to in case of the plague, St. Petronella under

agues, St. Apollonia against the tooth-ache? I shall expect his answer to this; and if he dares not deny it, as I am persuaded his modesty will not suffer him, I shall then ask him where the misrepresenting lies? If it be said to lie in this, that the Bishop "puts them upon the same file with Pagans," let us see how far he does so. He had laid down that rule of God's word a little before, "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve." And then he proceeds to the comparison, in which indeed he must be supposed to tax the Papists with contradicting that rule, by their practice of worshipping their diversity of saints, no less than the Pagans by serving their several petty gods. But he is so far from saying, that in all respects they are as bad as Pagans, which one would understand by "putting them all upon the same file," that he does not enter upon a comparison of aggravations, in respect to this very matter of worship; but only shews that rule is violated this way, no less than that. Now if this be a true charge, I conceive it is no ill manners to speak the truth in a case of such vast concern. If it be false, the Representor had done more service to his cause, and won more deserved thanks from his own communion, as well as ours, by shewing the difference between the one and the other, with respect to that commandment, than by declining, as he has done, not only the justification, but very craftily the confession too of the fact upon which the charge is grounded: insomuch as they "in whose head nothing lies distinctly," would be almost persuaded that the Representor accused the Bishop of downright lying, and that perhaps the Papists have not their tutelar saints, and saints proper for several occasions to pray to, as the Bishop pretended. But any thing in the world shall serve to swell the charge, when Protestants are to be set out for misrepresenters.

As little reason do I find for his severe charge upon the same Bishop, for observing that "some place their whole worship of God in bodily exercise,"* meaning, as I have good reason to offer for it, not all, but some Papists. For the Bishop proceeded to lay the same charge upon the Dissenters (without any currying I assure you), nay, to those of our communion also, as any one may see, p. 11. And what was said particularly of the externals, in which those Papists trust, whose religion runs out into nothing but external show, seems to me to note no more, than the greater danger they of the Roman

* P. 26, 27.

communion are in of falling into this kind of hypocrisy, by reason of the vast number of ceremonies and observations which they, above all other Christians in the world, have brought into religion. These are the passages which anger and ill-will have picked out of the whole sermon, to expose the Bishop to his Majesty's displeasure, by which one may see what little cause the Representer had to say, that "he pretends to his Majesty's word for abusing them." If the reader desires to know the motives he had for preaching and publishing this sermon, he will not take them, I suppose, as they are ridiculed by the Representer, but go for them to the preface itself, which declares what they were; and then he will find that the Representer has abused the Bishop.

Now whereas he found some passages in the Book of Homilies of the same strain with what he had noted in the foresaid sermon;* the same answer will therefore serve for both: and what he adds besides, in contempt of those divines that compiled the Homilies, is as easily answered with contempt. And so I come to that "heartly family prayer," which, as he says, "has raised up 'from Turk and Pope, defend us, Lord,' a note or two higher;" inasmuch as it runs thus: "O Lord, confound Satan, Antichrist, with all hirelings and Papists."† This prayer, he tells us, "is added to the end of the singing Psalms, in a Common-Prayer Book, printed at Oxford in the year 1683, in twelves;" by which I guess he would bring that University too, as well as the foresaid Bishop, under his Majesty's displeasure. And therefore this accusation is not to be passed lightly over. Now Henry Hills could have given him abundant satisfaction in this matter, if he had been consulted. For, upon the best inquiry I can make, I find that no Psalms in twelves were printed in Oxford before the year 1684, and therefore no such impression, as the Representer means, could be there in 1683. But this is not all: for neither had those printed in 1684, that "heartly family prayer" which he talks of. But the truth of the case is this, Henry Hills, or he and his partners, had printed these very Psalms, in twelves, which the Representer mentions, and that to a vast number, as I am informed by those who will make it out, if it be required. Now if Henry Hills bound up his Psalms with the Oxford Common-Prayer Books, the University is no more to answer for that, than if he had bound up his own Life with

* P. 25.

† P. 39.

one of them. It is such another suggestion the Representer offers at in a marginal note elsewhere, where he makes the fire of London to be imputed to the Papists, in the plates of the Common-Prayer Books printed at Oxford, A.D. 1680. For no such plates were printed there, however they came to be bound up with some Common-Prayer Books printed that year at the University. I am apt to think Henry Hills is able to give as good an account of this too, as another. And I believe he can guess very nearly, who did not only print since 1678, but has also very lately sold, a certain Confession of Faith, as hearty as the foresaid family prayer; for there idolaters and heretics, Papists and Anabaptists, are all put together, as limbs of Antichrist. But some men take themselves to be privileged to do these bold things themselves, and to accuse others of the like when they have done. I am sure that either the Representer, or he, is not a little to blame for these unhandsome insinuations; my own suspicions in this case I do not care to tell, and therefore I leave it betwixt them two, "to set the saddle on the right horse," as the Representer speaks upon another occasion.

Another way of misrepresenting them which he complains of is, "in laying on the colours with so much craft on the Papist tenets, that though they are the very same with what the most learned Protestants hold themselves, yet they shall appear so foul and monstrous, as if nothing less than a certain damnation attended their abettors. This," he says, "is done in several instances;" which makes me wonder that he chose so unlucky an instance, as that of "our rendering them so unchristian, for not allowing salvation to any out of their own Church:" in a word, for damning Protestants. But do we misrepresent them in this? Mark how the Representer makes it out: Dr. Tillotson, in the forementioned sermon, "inveighing against the uncharitableness of Papists—at last, in a rapture of charity, concludes, I have so much charity (and I desire always to have it) as to hope that a great many among them who live piously, and have been almost inevitably detained in that Church by the prejudice of education and an invincible ignorance, will upon a general repentance find mercy with God." Now instead of this, the Representer expected from the Doctor "some extraordinary piece of charity both for the reformation and example of the Papists: and yet, says he, after all the outcry and bustle, he wont allow one more grain of mercy to the Papists, than the Papists do them, that is only to such who

having lived piously, and truly repented of their sins, have an invincible ignorance to atone for all other errors of the understanding, which is the very doctrine of the Papists, in respect of such who die out of the communion of their Church." So that we have misrepresented Papists in pretending that they do not allow as great hopes of salvation to us continuing and dying Protestants, as we allow to them continuing and dying Papists.

Now I confess I am under some temptation to shew who is the misrepresenter in this case; but this is so good a hearing, that I will not go about to clear ourselves from being misrepresenters upon this occasion, but take him at his word, that here we are misrepresenters: nay, more than that, I will thank him for taking all opportunities to report us for such misrepresenters, to the people of both communions; for thus it may be hoped that we shall never more be troubled with that argument to persuade ours, and to confirm his, in the communion of the Roman Church, that since we grant the Papists a possibility of salvation, and they utterly deny a possibility of it to us, the communion of the Roman Church must needs be the more safe, inasmuch as both parties agree in a possibility of salvation in that Church, but they do not both agree upon such a possibility in ours. And since we are proclaimed misrepresenters upon this account, I desire also that from this time forward, the trade of going up and down with peremptory denouncing damnation to all of our communion, may be at an end, and never heard of more: and that no advantages may be made of our charitable hopes and concessions in behalf of some that die in the communion of the Church of Rome, since it seems the doctrine of the Papists is the very same in respect of such who die out of that communion: or, at least, that no regard be given to those of the Roman Church who shall hereafter positively denounce damnation against us, since the Representer will have it that we are as positive against them, inasmuch as to say that "Papists are guilty of sins inconsistent with salvation, is but to say, they are damned in another phrase." The Representer, I say, who takes upon him to correct all false notions of Popery, and is therefore much to blame if he be ignorant of the doctrines of Popery, has declared to the world, that whether in the way of hoping, or of censuring, "Protestants and Papists say the same things of each other:"* and therefore I think the foresaid requests are very reasonable ones; so that this one matter is in a way of

being fairly compounded, and if the Representer likes it, I am sure both parties are well pleased.

For want of other complaints, he takes up one at length, which he had dropped some time since, *viz.* that we "rake together some odd and extravagant opinions of some authors, to set them down for the received doctrine of the Church." * Which complaint he supports by nothing else but supposing that the so often-mentioned Archbishop of York is guilty of this in citing Bulgradus, &c. and that this "is enough to make any extravagancy pass for an article of faith." Now he does not so much as make it appear that this Archbishop pretends the extravagancies for which he brings those authorities, to be articles of faith in the Church of Rome. But how far their Church is chargeable with the several extravagancies of their authors, and what use we may and ought to make of their divines and casuists, &c. in the controversies now on foot, the Representer† has been already told very distinctly; and when he thinks fit to reply, he shall not want an answer. In the mean time, to convince us of the unwarrantableness of this method, and what a wretched thing it is to charge private doctrines upon a Church as articles of her faith, he brings in a Popish preacher inveighing against the ill manners, and especially the disloyalty of Protestants, upon one passage in the Decay of Christian Piety,‡ another in Sir R. Baker, and a third in Jovian. Now, I say, let them who do thus argue against the Church of Rome, as he makes his Popish preacher to inveigh against us, let them I say take the shame of it. But for any thing that he has done hitherto, the men are yet to be found out: though I do not know but upon very diligent search some one such or other may be taken amongst us; and when that happens, he shall go for me, and keep company with that once Protestant who believed the sermons of the Papists were made in a language unknown to the people. Now he confesses all this harangue to be a piece of sophistry, which he has put into the mouth of a Popish preacher:§ which is enough for me, and I am not at all moved by his pretending this was done to make us ashamed of practising it in good earnest, as he has seen and heard that we do. For this is a reason I am now pretty well used to, it being the very same wherewith he defends that ridiculous sermon which he composed for the

* P. 29.

† Pap. not Misrep. by Prot. p. 67, 68, 69. Ans. to Pap, Prot. p. 9.

‡ P. 30, 31, 32.

§ P. 33.

zealous brother. And therefore I shall even pin this harangue to the remainder of that brother's sermon, that when one is called for, the other may not be forgotten.

And so at last we come to misrepresenting, in relation to some matters of fact and history, and here he hopes the reader will discover notable things. The first misrepresentation of this kind, in which he instances, was the misrepresenting of the rich hangings, the massy plate, and other things which adorned the altars in the times before the Reformation,* the candlesticks, crucifixes, and shrines; three episcopal houses, with four or five churches, &c. For these were represented as superstitious or superfluous, and forthwith were immediately blown up. Now a man shall not presently find how this comes to be misrepresenting the Papists in relation to some matters of fact and history. He names but one Protestant speaking of these things, *viz.* Dr. Heylin, and he too is brought in agreeing with the Representer in charging those doings upon covetousness, ambition, and envy; nor is any other cited as contradicting him. Was not the Representer full of choler and bitterness, that he must needs ease himself whether it be in a fit place or not? I see the bottom of this business plainly enough: if that Reformation of doctrine and worship which our Church made, be not blackened enough already, he is resolved to charge upon it all the faults of the great men that made advantages by the change. But must the vices of the statesmen in those days necessarily affect the Reformation? Why then must not the vices of Popes affect Popery? If he has a mind to it, let him represent the former ten times worse than they were, and when he has done, I will shew him as many Popes represented by their own historians as really bad as he has made those by fiction, and this too by historians of no less credit among them, than Dr. Heylin is with us. The Representer owes us a good turn, and if he can but bring in the word misrepresenting, it is all the pertinence he cares for, though it be misrepresenting plate and hangings.

Again, because he fancies that King Henry VIII. made way for Protestantism† to enter into the world (in which however he is mistaken), he taxes him boldly of vile extravagancies, the respect that is due to crowned heads, no, nor the consideration of that line in which this prince stood amongst them, being not able to restrain him. But where is the misrepresentation complained of? Certainly, the Pope's power here

* P. 33.

† P. 34.

might be an usurpation, though the motive upon which Henry VIII. threw it quite off (as it had been curbed by his predecessors before), should not prove the best in the world: but let the Representor here also use his liberty of rendering him as odious as he can, remembering all the while that the faults of that prince reflect no less dishonour upon the Church of Rome, than upon the Church of England, as it is now reformed: for it is certain, that in all other points he was a Papist, excepting that only of the supremacy; unless the Representor will say that the whole of their religion is in effect this, that the Pope should be all in all, in the dominions of every Christian prince in the world.

Luther comes next upon the file for "marrying a nun contrary to his vow of chastity." By which he means a vow of celibacy,* as if the marriage vow were not a vow of chastity too. But do not their own divines say, that the vow of continency may be dispensed with? And has not the Pope dispensed with it in greater matters? Had Luther married with his dispensation, he had it seems committed no fault at all. And we are apt to think that if, notwithstanding his vow, he had good reason to marry, he might do it safely enough without the Pope's dispensation. But where is the misrepresentation now? Why, here is a vow of continency represented as a rash and inconsiderate vow, and this is misrepresenting Papists in relation to matters of fact and history. And thus also honest Sir William misrepresented chalices, crosses, images, nay, guineas, &c. into Popish trinkets and trumpery, and made them fit for seizure. But I say neither was Sir William honest in doing it, nor the Representor† over wise in mentioning it here.

His next fling is at Sir Richard Baker, who upon the executions of several great men in Queen Mary's reign, chanced to say, according to his wonted eloquence: "now the cataracts of severity will be opened, that will make it rain blood." Well, but to bring off honest Sir Richard for once, he does not say that this severity was tyrannical or unjust, for if he had, certainly the Representor had brought us all under the lash for it: but the ends of these great people being tragical, he thought good to set the matter off with a tragical, or as the Representor calls it, a pat phrase, without any further design. And then as for the other blood spilt in Queen Mary's reign, which he seems to charge altogether upon provocations, tu-

* P. 34.

† P. 35.

mults, seditions, and rebellions; he is guilty of the same fault, which he accuses Protestants of, *viz.* of representing things by halves. Were none put to death in those days but for such causes? Were Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, Taylor, and almost all the 300 spoken of, burnt for heresy or not? Was not the question concerning the sacrament of the altar, the burning question? For those that were guilty of the abuses he mentions, they might thank themselves, we defend them not. But what colour is there for representing all as such? And why will the Representer put us upon talking of these things, who had said nothing of them, if he had not forced us to it in our own defence?

But to see now how much there goes in the telling a story: Queen Elizabeth* put to death, as he says, "two hundred persons upon the score of conscience, without any actual crime or misdemeanor against the ancient statutes of the land." Two hundred persons! Truly I do not know but in her long reign of about forty years, so many might be put to death. But I wish the Representer, since he pronounces in general with so much confidence, had named one or two that were put to death upon the score of conscience, and likewise what point of conscience it was. However, something is necessary to be said in general answer to that charge which he plainly intends, though he would not plainly speak it out. In short therefore, about ten years after the Queen came to the crown, Pope Pius Quintus sends over his bull for the excommunicating and deposing her; upon which followed the statute against the execution of it: which yet did not hinder several priests and Jesuits from trying to have it executed, in pursuance whereof the Queen's life was more than once in danger. And therefore when no other remedy would serve the turn, all Popish priests of the Queen's subjects, were banished under the penalty of treason, and had forty days given them to prepare for departing. This law was made at least twelve years (I believe more) after the Pope's brief was sent hither: and upon this law some priests that were afterwards found here, were executed, and some were not, who, though coming into England contrary to the law, yet withal, giving security for their dutiful behaviour to the Queen, were, without changing their religion, set at liberty: for, if we may believe one that knew these things better than the Representer seems to do, though our princes judged it necessary for their own safety, that this law should

* P. 36.

continue in force, yet to avoid the doing of any thing that looked like putting men to death upon the score of conscience, they qualified the rigour of it by their own mercy, where a treasonable design did not otherwise appear. For when Goodman, a Jesuit, was reprieved by * King Charles I. and the King was expostulated with by the Parliament about it, he signified the cause to be this, that Goodman had been found guilty, merely as being a priest, which was the reason of the King's mercy, and that in this clemency he did but follow the examples of his father King James, and of Queen Elizabeth. Now whether we should believe King Charles the Martyr, or our Representer, I leave others to judge. This general account may serve for his general charge; and I do not think fit to run out into more particulars, unless the Representer gives occasion; but I leave him to consider better of these things: and when he has done it, he may perhaps feel a little shame for having said just before in the case of Queen Mary, "now one would think, to be just to crowned heads, the blood should not be exposed alone to the people, but likewise the occasions and provocations given:" and in Queen Elizabeth's case I will add, and the mercy also that was shewn, notwithstanding those occasions and provocations that were given her.

But whereas he calls the law we speak of, "a law of her own contriving, a law so cruel that the like is scarce to be found among the Mahometans, who though they have conquered many Christian nations, yet never, as he has heard of, made it treason for their natives to profess their own religion, or maintain their pastors." To let pass the misrepresentation he insinuates, of making it treason to profess their own religion, it would almost tempt a man to search the records of old time, to see if something has not passed in the world as cruel as this law, if it had been executed to the utmost rigour. For why should Queen Elizabeth, under whose reign our nation purchased some glory abroad, suffer now at home the imputation of being the most tyrannical prince that ever was in the world; beyond the examples of Mahometans? and of Mahometans too in their severity towards the Christian nations which they have conquered; why this is strange indeed, and not to be taken upon the Representer's word: for there are annals that speak of a certain law, not indeed for the banishing of people upon the score of conscience, but the keeping of them at home to be tormented for their conscience. Had they been suffered

* An. 1640, Jan. 25.

to use the liberty that our Saviour once gave, of flying into another country when they were persecuted in their own; it had been a favour in comparison to the restraint; and death had been a mercy to the vexations they endured. The like to this indeed is scarce to be found even amongst those whom the Representer speaks of: and which made the case yet harder, this people had not deserved ill of the state, they neither sided with foreign powers, nor with domestic rebels; nay, they had behaved themselves so well, that there was nothing but their virtue to make them feared. But histories say that those of them who escaped by miracles of Providence, were well received every where, and especially by a prince who was not of their own religion, but yet to his immortal glory gave them refuge and relief in his own countries.

As to the Powder Plot which he next mentions: his insinuation concerning my Lord Cecil, has been so often exposed, and if it were true, is so unable to lessen the guilt of those that were concerned in it, that I see no reason why I must needs enter into that history: we do not charge all of that communion with it, but we have reason vehemently to suspect all that went about to excuse, and positively to condemn all that thought fit to praise the traitors. But if we should have charged, as he pretends we do, the Church of Rome with this treason, yet I am confident the rebellion of the West stands not altogether so fair to be imputed to the Church of England: for surely there was no act of this Church for the excommunicating and deposing of the King, but it was the sight of the Pope's brief to such a purpose as that, inspired one of the traitors, as himself confessed, with those thoughts that at last settled upon the Powder Plot. And I think it was a Church of England Parliament, and a Church of England army that so loyally served his Majesty upon that occasion in the West: but let the Representer shew, if he can, that the Papists were as serviceable in the prevention of the Powder Plot.

We are now drawing to an end of a tedious complaint, which surely cannot last much longer, when he is fain to spin it out with a story of the "long devilish knives"* which Papists were said to procure for cutting of the Protestants' throats. For I am so perfect a stranger to the least report of this matter, till I met with it here, that I can say nothing to it. As for the fire of London, that I confess I have heard of, and likewise that many charged it upon the Papists; now for those that did so, I hope I may without offence offer that excuse for their

* Pag. 39.

credulity, which I take a hint of from the Representor himself; it could not be expected but that the grief of so undoing a calamity in vast numbers of suffering people, should discharge itself in accusing those as the authors of it, who, as they believed, were well pleased with it: as for the Representor, what his thoughts are towards London, he has given us plainly to understand, in calling it a Protestant Sodom, which Heaven consumed. Now I dare say this was not meant for a lamentation over the sins and sufferings of the city: but if men will go on to insult at this rate, they should however be less clamorous against those mistakes, of which the greatest occasions are given by themselves.

Then as to that which he calls a Monsieur's invention: they that gave credit to it, have this to say for themselves, that Du Moulin's public offer to make full proof of his story, when authority should require it, stood many years, even to the day of his death; which was no improbable argument that he was provided with reasonable good testimony, though it was not thought fit to call upon him for it. This may be said to shew, that if there were never so many that swallowed the story, yet this was no reason for the Representor's furious exclamations: for I am by no means satisfied that they who believed it, did so in defiance to all their senses; for though there were actors and contrivers of the murder of King Charles I. as public as the noon-light, yet I do not feel any such contradiction, in supposing that some contrivers there might be, who were not as public as the noon-light: and when the Representor thinks of it better, he will say so too, unless he will say, that because the contrivers of that dark treason of the Powder Plot, were at last as public as the noon-light, therefore that it was in all likelihood a contrivance too of the good Lord Cecil, cannot be credited, but in defiance to all our senses. And yet after all, how does it appear that we have laid any such stress upon Du Moulin's relation, as the Representor intimates? For my own part, in all the conversation I have had amongst Protestants, I can remember nothing concerning it, but that it has been sometimes a little wondered at, that he was never required to prove his story. And therefore I doubt the Representor has here played the part of an unwise man, in reviving a story to the disadvantage of the Papists, which died with the first report of it, as we thought at least; for unless the Representor thought we had some reason to believe it, why should he go about to complain that we do believe it? I think we

have been more just to his party, than he has. For our sense as to this matter is, that since now the story is not capable either of being proved, or disproved, it is to be let fall, and the world is no more to be troubled about it; though whilst Du Moulin was alive, it was not to be expected but that one or other would be harping upon it.

At last he comes to the "Garagantua misrepresentation of them all, that is, the divine Oates with his Popish plot."* And here, as from a castle where he is safe from all possibility of assault, he bids defiance to us with all the rhetoric that anger and scorn can inspire a man withal. But because he lets fly at the pulpits for this, and so makes the clergy to have given what authority they could to Oates' lies from their pulpits, I must needs change a word or two with him about that in our own defence, and tell him that neither is himself of that credit, nor the thing itself so likely, but that it stood in great need of particular proofs. I know not but that amongst ten thousand men, here and there one might deliver the news of the *pilgrims*, and the *black bills* from the pulpit. But I never heard of any that did, and I almost think that if the Representer had known a few instances of this kind, out they had come, if it had been for nothing but to support the credibility of his general accusation. And to go further with him, whereas he confidently says, "that the *whole* plot was received with that welcome and credit, that what would have been questioned in the very Scripture, was entertained without any scruple:" I will make bold to ask him, by whom it was entertained? did himself believe the whole plot, while he was a Protestant? If he did, undoubtedly we have not lost one of the wisest of our party. If he did not, neither did any body else that ever I could hear of, though perhaps many might believe more than was true. But for a more particular account who believed much, who little, who nothing at all of Oates's discoveries, and the reasons of his several opinions, he must excuse me for that; I am resolved not to be drawn in. Nor have I lately spoken with every man in the nation. And it is only for a Representer to talk of these matters, and to pronounce generally without exception, though he does it also without examination of the particulars beforehand.

Thus far I have waited upon the Representer in examining the reasons, upon which he pretends that we use I know not

how many methods to misrepresent Papists, though it has been every step out of the way : for if all had been true that he pretends, what is all this to the defence of his thirty-seven chapters ? What is it to his Answerers, who had no more to do than to rid their hands of those thirty-seven chapters ? and they have done it so effectually, that the Representer has thought good to rid his hands of them too.

But I think by this time, it may appear that he has all this while given us just cause to complain, that we are many ways misrepresented by Papists, though the Representer, without just cause, was resolved to be beforehand, in the same complaint against us.

For not to repeat those misrepresentations, false constructions, and wry interpretations of Protestant authors, &c. which I have shewn him to be guilty of, in examining some of his complaints ; it were a very easy matter to convict him of no less untrue than spiteful insinuations against all Protestants without exception in this, and in his other pieces. I shall at present give but one instance, and that in this his last reply, where he says, " that the Protestant persuasion has its name, being, and support not from what it is in itself, but from what it is not, in defying and protesting against their neighbours."* It is easy to see what notion of Protestants such passages as these are intended to imprint upon the minds of men. But does the Representer in good earnest, believe that our religion is a mere negative religion, and that we should have none at all, if we had no neighbours to defy, and to protest against ? Or does he believe that our religion, so far as it is negative, is supported by defying and protesting against other men ; does he not know that we at least pretend to support it by reason, Scripture, and antiquity ? Nay, does he believe that there are no affirmative points of religion which we maintain against them, and in respect of which they do in reality protest against us, though it seems we have got the name of Protestants. If he does believe thus of us, much more if knowing the contrary he says so however, where is truth, charity, or justice ? If we take the religion of Protestants, as it stands in opposition to the errors of the Church of Rome, it is in many points affirmative, and the negative is on that Church's side. For instance, that God only is to be worshipped, is as affirmative a conclusion, as that God is but one ; and that Christian people are bound to read

the Scriptures is as affirmative, as that they are bound to say their prayers; and that the laity have a right to the communion under both kinds, is surely as affirmative as that they have a right to one only. Why then does the Representer say, "that the Protestant profession has its name, being and support, not from what it is in itself, but from what it is not." But to let this pass, what although the points held by us in opposition to the Church of Rome were only negatives; yet, why must we be so bitterly represented, as if our persuasion were supported by nothing but peevishness and a spirit of contradiction to our neighbours? Why must we be brought in as defying and protesting against our neighbours? As if we opposed their doctrines and practices in despite to their persons, and not rather blamed them for saying and doing things which we at least think are not to be justified? There are divers things surely, which neither Christians nor men ought to do; and so far as our religion stands in not doing such things, one would think it is not the worse for being negative, nor our practice to be blemished for having its name from what it is not. And therefore when men come in with their negatives in religion, and their protestations against false persuasions and evil practices; they are not without more ado to be represented as defying and protesting against their neighbours. But least of all, should it be insinuated, as if our whole religion in effect stood in this defying and protesting: for we do in the first place glory in this, that we are Christians, though we are not ashamed to be called Protestants. In our religious assemblies where we confess our faith before God and the world; we profess no other articles of faith, than those in which the Church of Rome agrees with us. By this it is that we are Christians, and it is this that makes them so. This faith which we profess, and into which we were baptized, is the foundation of our assurance, that if we live accordingly, we shall be saved, and of our hopes that those among them who are disposed to receive the truth, and repent heartily of all known sins, shall find mercy with God notwithstanding their captivity to those errors which if we should profess, we could not have the least hope for ourselves. In the mean time for our negatives against that Church, we offer in our own defence, that the religion which the Scriptures teach, is such a negative religion as ours; they not enjoining, and in some points forbidding what we do not do; and that the truly primitive Fathers neither professed those doctrines, nor did

those things, which the Church of Rome would have us to profess and to do ; so that their religion was not more positive, nor less negative than ours. But if it grieves good men in the Roman communion, that there should be amongst Christians, any protestation of one party against what is done by another, it is a grief also to us ; only with this difference, that we cannot help it, but they can. For if they will reform the terms of their communion by the Scriptures and primitive antiquity, they shall soon see an end of our protesting, and that our persuasion is not supported, as this Representer saith, by defying and protesting against our neighbours ; than which he could not have said a viler thing against us, no not if he had put us upon the same file with infidels and Pagans ; since this is in effect to say, that we have no religion but in crossness to other people.

But at this rate we have been used all along, though we have made no complaints of it, only they force us to it now, whether we will or no : thus even in their Catechisms, where one would expect plainness and sincerity, we find ourselves misrepresented in that manner, as if there was no such way of making novices fast to their Church, but by giving them false notions of ours : for at present to name no more than their famous Douay Catechism, there you shall find the teacher giving this wise reason, "Why Protestants are so divided, and damn one another for mis-believers ?"* Because, forsooth, it is the very groundwork of Protestantism that all men, even the whole Church of God, are fallible and subject to error. We say indeed that all men are subject to error ; but the very groundwork of Protestantism is not, as this catechist pretends, that the Church of Rome and every other Church is subject to error, but that she hath actually erred, and that grievously too. And his inference from hence is no less a misrepresentation than his principle : "So that," says he, "they cannot pretend to certainty or infallibility in any one point of their belief." So that because he is pleased to put certainty and infallibility together, he must needs teach his scholar that we have not so much as certainty of our faith, nay, not of one point of it : and, which is still more false, that we cannot pretend to it. No wonder that we find it so hard a matter to get a little discourse about religion with those whom they have had the breeding of, when we see what an absurd pretence to religion they represent ours

* Abridgment of Christian Doctr. p. 42. Douay, 1655.

to be all at once ; especially since they take care to let them know, "that it is not well possible for any two Protestants or sectaries to be of one religion, every man expounding the Scriptures as he lists, and no one having power to control the other's exposition of it."* Which if their scholars believe, they must needs conclude that Protestants must profess as many religions almost, as there are men and women ; since it is not well possible for any two of them to be of one and the same religion : and, I think, any body may see that this is taught, to discourage all who are educated in this persuasion of us, from hearing what we have to say for ourselves, since by hearkening to one or two of us they are never the nearer, but must talk perhaps with a million before they can understand the religion of Protestants, nay, and shall then be as much to seek for it as they were at first. For what he says of "every man's expounding the Scripture as he lists, no one having power to control the other's exposition of it:" it is also an untrue suggestion, if by expounding the Scripture as we list, he means arbitrary and groundless expositions of Scripture. Which when the Representer pleases, I can prove the Church of Rome to be more guilty of than any Church that we know in the world besides : if any are guilty of it amongst us, there is a power in our Church to control them, which has also been used upon occasion, unless by power he means a cudgel, and this we do take to be Church power. Again, he says that "all heretics pretend equally to the Scripture for their novelties and heresies (which is not true neither), no one of them ever yielding to another:"† which is notoriously false ; for many of those whom he calls heretics have yielded to the reasonings of others out of the Scriptures, who are also heretics with him : and this plainly shews that some of these men care not what they say to disgrace us, when they will so positively affirm a thing which it is impossible for them to know but it may be false ; nay, which it is not well possible for them not to know that it is false.

It is after the same way that our doctrines and practices are represented by retail ; of which I shall give you but one instance which I well remember, and that is where the catechist assuring his scholar that their laity received whole Christ under one kind, tell him also that this "is incomparably more than the pretended Reformers have under both, who receive only a bit

* Id. p. 42.

† Id. p. 44.

of baker's bread, with a poor sup of common vintner's wine."* By which scandalous way of representing our communion to a novice, he would be apt to believe that when we celebrate the eucharist, our great business is to send to the baking-house for bread, and to the tavern for wine; and so we fall to eating and drinking without any more to do. If he would be steeling his novice against us, he should at least have been so just to us, as to let him know that we do not give the people common bread and wine, though we do not pretend to give them the natural substance of Christ's body and blood.

For that way of misrepresenting us, by charging the particular opinions of some Protestants upon all: they have the confidence to do it, even in those points wherein neither Protestants nor Papists are of the same mind among themselves. And though the Douay Catechism represents us so divided, that it is not well possible for any two of us to be of the same religion, yet, when again it is for their turn to represent us otherwise, there is not an odd opinion of any Protestant, but forthwith it belongs to the religion of all the rest. Thus we have been charged for "making God the author of sin," and that for nothing but for the sake of those opinions held by some Protestants, which are no less vehemently defended by some Papists; in which kind of representations, no man, I think, has outdone the Reconciler of Religions (whoever he was), printed in the year 1663. "They teach," says he, "profane, false, and ungodly doctrines, as for example, that God is the author of sin; that Christ despaired upon the cross." Which latter opinion, this man and Fevardentius, and divers others, as I well remember, fasten upon Calvin; and then talk as if it were the received doctrine of all Protestants. "So," says he, "they say that Christ suffered the pains of hell upon the cross, and that this was his descension into hell."† See Calvin here, Psalm xv. Now I think Calvin does say so: but it is so small a matter in comparison, to charge what one says upon all, that I shall lay no great stress upon it; but that which follows is admirable. "Neither," says he, "are they miserably mad only, but also diabolically malicious; for it is of mere purpose they say and do thus, lest that by clear places of tradition and Scripture, they should be constrained to confess that there is a purgatory." Are not these rare men, thus at once to charge us with what we do not say or do, and withal

* Id. p. 204.

† P. 14.

to pronounce concerning our intentions in so doing, and that in this vile manner, that no honest heathen ever used his neighbour so? Nay, if you will believe this Representer, "they that hear sectarian ministers are not believers, for they do not truly believe in God the Father Almighty, nor in Jesus Christ his only Son."* For he knows their hearts better than they do themselves, and let them be never so confident that they do, he will prove that they "do not believe in the Holy Ghost."† And he peremptorily says that they "do not believe the communion of saints." And lastly, that "neither do they believe forgiveness of sins." For which he brings an excellent reason, because they say, "the priests cannot forgive sins." Though we do not say that neither, but only that they cannot forgive sins absolutely; which now they would persuade us too, to be their own doctrine. Thus he has made us infidels almost throughout the Creed,‡ only at last he grants, that we believe the "resurrection of the flesh, and the life everlasting," which I wonder at, because it was as easy to invent a reason why we believe not this neither, as for all the rest. But then even in this matter, we are no better believers than the devil. "For," says he, "this they believe, and so do the devils."

No wonder, therefore, that he comes afterward, and puts us upon the same file with Turks and heathens. "As the Turks are divided and subdivided among themselves, so are the Protestants. The Turks, wheresoever they come, demolish churches, destroy crosses, and beat down and break altars and images; so do the Protestants.§ The Turks cannot abide praying to saints; no more can the Protestants. The Turks love not beads nor holy water; no more do the Protestants. The Turks, above all things, hate the most holy sacrifice of the mass, and so do the Protestants; which alone is enough to shew that in their religion or belief, they are like Turks and heathens." This I think may serve at least to set against the Bishop of Kilmore's parallel. Though I ought to ask the Bishop's pardon for making the comparison. For as to that parallel between Protestants and Turks, it is not in every particular true, for Protestants do not demolish churches wheresoever they come, nor break down altars, nor destroy crosses, nor always images. And as to the particulars that agree to both, how much malice soever there may be, I am sure there is little wit in putting them and us together upon these

* Ibid.

† P. 15.

‡ P. 16.

§ P. 17.

accounts. For certainly, we are no more obliged to do any ill things, because the Turks themselves forbear them, than we are obliged to forbear any useful or innocent customs, merely because the Papists use them. Had this Reconciler shewn our agreement with the Turks in some practices that we could not but confess they are to blame for; this indeed had been a shrewd instruction to us, to amend that in ourselves which we cannot but condemn in people so grossly deceived as they are. Now this it was that the Bishop of Kilmore did in that comparison of the Papists worshipping their tutelar saints, with the heathens worshipping their petty gods. The Papists do with us, justly condemn these practices of the heathens. The Bishop only desires them, being thus prepared, to look at home. But to infer that in our religion, we are like Turks and heathens, because we forbear those things which the Turks are to be justified in not doing, is a misrepresentation of us, upon so wry an inference, that if there be not want of wit to excuse it, it will be found equivalent to a downright misrepresentation, which the genius of this author, as it appears by the particulars of this book, makes me fear it is.

And of a great many particulars which I might note, there is one not to be let pass, and that is, that he does in very good earnest* affirm that we adore the sacrament, though the Representor would be thought to charge us with it, little more than in jest. "For," says the Reconciler, "though they say thus of us for worshipping of images, yet they can dispense with themselves in worshipping their sacrament." And if this be not jesting, it is something a great deal worse, for it is as notorious that we do not worship the sacrament, as it is that the Papists do.

But to go on with him a little farther. "Their preachers," saith he, "what are they forsooth? intruders, thieves and robbers, hypocrites, ravenous wolves, and murderers;† sons of Belial, false prophets, and priests of Baal; which is their heresy, rebellion and stubbornness against the Church.—And if the preachers be so, what must the hearers be? Why sure enough, they shall both fall into the ditch of everlasting burning brimstone and fire, &c. unless they be converted, do penance, and live in the Church." Now this way of misrepresenting, by railing at and damning us, is as crafty a method as any they have to imprint upon weak minds an incurable

* P. 16.

† P. 51.

prejudice against our communion. For when we are confidently represented as damnable wretches, that shall certainly be damned, if we continue Protestants; especially by men that at other times talk demurely, and always look gravely when they give us these good words, it cannot be expected but that some or other should believe there is more than ordinary reason for it, though they are not able to find it out. We may say what we will in our own defence, let but these men go on to say still that we are damned, and the very noise and din of these words and the like, shall make them deaf to all the reasons we can bring. And therefore every degree of this dealing is to be condemned in any party, wherever it is found, because it is a way to work upon the passions and imaginations of people; and instead of directing, it does but confound their judgment. But I must needs say we have suffered under this injustice by those of the Church of Rome, beyond any example that I have yet seen.

Of which, I will give the Representer one instance so remarkable, that it may serve instead of a great many. Mr. Harding, who had to deal with no less a man than Bishop Jewel, thought fit to use us in this fashion, as follows: "Ye are moved by the instinct of Satan; the devil hath you fast bound, and ye are the children of the devil: ye are the limbs of Antichrist."* Our Church he calls the synagogue of Antichrist and Lucifer; and we are no better with him than profane hell-hounds, wicked Cain's brood, Turkish Huguenots, worse than infidels;† nay, he says that the fiends of hell begat Lutherans and Calvinists;‡ and that we would say, if we durst, that Christ is the abomination of desolation,§ and that Antichrist is the true God.|| And then I think he had reason to say, that the devil coming from hell, hath carried us away. Thus in his Rejoinder he bids the hell-hounds of Zuinglius and Luther's litter, bark until their bellies break; and calls the Defender one that is like a mad dog;¶ and for all this, tells him that he will leave his vile eloquence to himself (the Defender). He that has a mind to see more of this, may find two pages in folio full of it, just before the Preface to the Bishop's Defence of his Apology. Now it is easy to judge what effects this kind of eloquence will work upon weak minds, especially when he that uses it has the face to say as Harding

* Confut. fol. 202.

§ F. 194.

† F. 195.

|| F. 225.

‡ F. 183.

¶ Rejoind. p. 178, 207, 111.

did in his Preface to his Confutation, "the manner of writing which I have here used, in comparison of the adversary's, is sober, soft, and gentle, and in respect of their heat, bitterness and railing, as many tell me, over-cold, sweet, and mild."

I do not say that they never speak of us but in this strain, for I do well remember that the Apology for the Papists, which came out about six or seven years after the Restoration, treats us after another manner, I mean *us* of the Church of England, for then it could call us men, brethren, and fathers, and would fain unite them and us together against the fanatics. For why? then we were somebody, and it was not amiss to curry with us. But there was a time when we indeed were as nobody; and then the Dissenters were worth being curried with; insomuch, that Dr. Holden, who was always esteemed by us as a person of the best temper and truest moderation among them, could not forbear shewing the difference he put between them and us, even where there was no necessity at all so to do, but the mere necessity of currying. For to a discourse concerning Infallibility in Religion, printed at Amsterdam, 1652, Dr. Holden gave his approbation in these words, amongst others, that the book "demonstrated the false foundations of the Presbyterian consistory; of the Socinian ratiocination; of the Independents' private spirit; and of the *erroneous, or rather no grounds or principles of the late particular English Protestant schismatical synagogue.*" But why are the several Dissenters so softly and gently touched; Presbyterian consistory; what harm in a consistory? or in ratiocination? Nor is much anger expressed in giving the private spirit to the Independents. Why, surely, these are all complimented in comparison to the Church of England, which is the "*particular English Protestant schismatical synagogue, of erroneous or rather of no grounds or principles at all.*" But why this difference I say? Why, nothing is plainer, it was then *the late* Church of England. But when the Apology came forth, it was then the present Church of England again. Then was then, and now was now. Thus we are used by some of the very best of them.

But to return to our Reconciler; he wisely considered that we might take sanctuary in the Bible, against the hard words and reproaches they persecute us with; and therefore to spoil that retreat, he will not allow that we have the word of God amongst us, for thus he saith, "the Protestant or sectarian Bible is defective, therefore evil, and consequently not the word

of God; for besides what we have above said, almost every year they correct it, and mend it, chop it and change it as they do their almanacs, adding thereunto what they will, and subtracting what they please." This is such misrepresenting that I had rather the Representer should give the proper name to it, than do so myself; nay, if this man were to be believed, we make such material alterations in the version or edition of our Bible every year, as infers a necessity of altering our religion upon it, the Bible being the ground of our religion. "For," says he, "neither do they change their Bible only, but also their religion and fashion thereof grounded on it. If then every following year's Bible be better than the former, why may not the next year's Bible be better than this year, and so to the end of the world?"* and in the mean time the sectarian Bible never be perfect, or better than a yearly almanac; not so good as an almanac for ever, as is *Erra Pater*, or the Shepherd's Prognostication, or Seaman's Calendar. Why then should it be more the word of God than *Æsop's Fables*, or the Turkish *Alcoran*?" One would think now that he had done his worst against our Bible, but he understood his trade better than so, and therefore because this calumny needed it very much, he was resolved to help it with a good share of that confidence, which I observed before, was peculiar to these men. For, as if he had been yet over-cold, sweet and mild, he mends the matter by saying that our "Bible is worse than *Æsop's Fables*; it is diabolical inventions, and heretical labours, and a sacrilegious instrument to deceive and damn all such poor souls as believe it, and therefore to be burnt with fire in the middle of the market at noon, and let all the people say Amen, so be it."† This was a good hearty man I warrant him, and would not willingly lose his business by doing it by halves.

I should now have done with him, but that I find him afterwards imposing upon his reader with as shameful a downright misrepresentation of us as ever was invented: for, says he, of our clergy,‡ "All their mission was either in the inspiration of a spirit they know not what, or the commission of a child, or the letters-patents of a woman, or the illicit or invalid ordination or mission of or by one Scory, an apostate monk, who ordained the first bishops at the Nag's-head, in Cheapside, in Queen Elizabeth's time." Now I would desire the Repre-

* Recon. p. 38.

† P. 41.

‡ P. 50.

sender to consider with himself how he would have set us forth to the world, if we had invented the story of Pope Joan, as they have done this of the Nag's-head ordination; why, surely he would have mustered up all his figures to represent us as the lewdest varlets upon the face of the earth. But though we have received that story from their own authors, and know what advantages to make of it if we needed them; yet we are very willing to hear what any learned man can say to disprove it, and to allow all reasonable presumptions against it. Of our adversaries we beg none of this candour, and desire no more of them than not to tell tales of us of their own invention. As to this Nag's-head business, I ask the Representers two things, one is, whether they have not commonly and boldly reported it up and down amongst us? Let him then remember how he declaimed against us for creating in the people such an aversion to Popery, which he did not wonder at, because he "considered that ten thousand pulpits have been for many years declaiming against them, where every man has had the liberty of exposing them as he pleased," &c.* Well, but what must we have expected by this time if the ten thousand pulpits had been all this while at their service, when they have not been afraid to publish such scandalous untruths against us, even whilst they had not all the liberty of doing as they please, which he imagines we have taken: if they take this freedom of telling of tales, even here amongst us, without any colour of proof, and against the testimony of unquestionable records, we may, I think, without uncharitableness guess, that where they are under no restraint, they "represent our doctrines as they please, and charge them with what consequences and interpretations they please, and expose our practices as they please, &c. and make narratives of us as they please, and make us as guilty as they please, and have made truth and Gospel of anything against us as they please." And when I consider these things I cannot wonder that in some parts of Spain (where the misrepresenting trade has gone rarely forward), they are made to believe that we English, since we turned heretics, are grown satyrs, and have gotten horns and tails.

I am now something weary of this unprofitable labour, and shall therefore add but one thing more, which is, that some of them are wont to reproach their adversaries only by their faults, when they pretend to give them their whole character,

* Reply, p. 43.

and to add what they have any colour for out of their own heads, and sometimes without any colour at all; but especially when the manner and circumstances of their dying are to be related, for here the attention and passions of the reader are commonly raised very high; of all which Bolsec's Life of Calvin is a memorable instance:* thus, when he brings him to a declining age, he tells us the "several diseases which afflicted him for many years to the last gasp, were a certain and express token and testimony of God's anger against him;" and answers that objection against it from the calamities that befell Job, by the deliverance God sent him at last; which kind of reasoning gives every man to the devil that dies of painful and tormenting diseases. But not content to argue from those diseases by which Beza said that he ended his life, *viz.* consumption, cholic, stone, &c. incident all of them to old age, and especially to men of a sedentary life, Bolsec adds one out of his own brain, "with which," as he says, "God's open enemies by his just judgment have been punished, *viz.* that he had a most filthy and poisonous ulcer about his lower parts, which were corroded by vermin. Thus," says he, "Honorius, the second king of the Vandals, died, after he had persecuted the orthodox Church eight years; thus Maximianus, the most cruel enemy of the Christians; and thus Antiochus, and thus Herod, who usurped the honour of God; thus many more hypocrites and enemies of God perished, who under pretence and colour of sanctity and zeal, had fought against the truth, and after a miserable death in this world, have been thrown headlong into the everlasting torments of hell." And in this manner, as he says, was Calvin marked out; nay, he affirms it to be most true, "that the wretch, not being able to bear his horrible tortures, called upon the devil, and expired with oaths, curses, and blasphemies." Well, but one would expect now a very notable proof of so wonderful a matter as this was, and of all the rest that he says upon this occasion: "Why," says Bolsec, "they have given testimony to this, who were about him in his sickness to the last; and therefore let Beza and others deny it as they please, the thing is sufficiently plain." Was ever malicious story supported by more feeble testimony than this? It seems we must take Bolsec's word, that Calvin's friends and servants reported these things: but can any man be so silly as to think that if Bolsec had come to the knowledge of this by any certain or probable means of intelligence, that he, I say,

* Bolsec. Vit. Calv. c. 22.

would have suffered us to go without it? But then if he had pretended particular proofs, he had laid himself open to be particularly baffled; for which reason the safest way was to say in general, the servants said so, and the thing is plain, and there is an end.

Thus also Cochlaeus represents Luther's death, *viz.* that he went to bed merry and drunk, and was next morning found dead in his bed, his body being black, and his tongue lolling out as if he had been strangled, which some think was done by the devil, some by his wife; and as they carried him to the church to bury him, his body stank so that they were constrained to throw it into a ditch, and so they departed. Which is a very pleasant story, but that another tells it so crossly that it is impossible but one of them must be guilty of leeing. The truth is, they were so impatient, that these kind of tales were told and sent up and down before the man himself was dead, as I shall further acquaint the Representer when he desires it.

In the mean time I forbear, as he says, and wish there may be no occasion given, to carry on the controversy in this manner. This very little that I have said of a great deal more that remains, being designed only to shew them what may be done, if they think fit to leave the question, and to fall upon us for misrepresenting them instead of maintaining their doctrines like scholars and disputants.

There remains now but one thing more to be considered, and that is, what reason the Representer had to tax the author of the Exposition of our doctrine, with "wishing for moderation in the deepest satire, condemning the want of civility in others, with the most exasperating reflections of his own," and a great deal more to this purpose; which, according to the most impartial judgment that I can make, is all said without cause given. And the declamation of the Representer hereupon, shews only that if he had lighted upon a fit subject, the man does not want words to set it out to the life. But what has that author done? He charges them with "their art of palliating, with want of fairness and civility, with laying aside moderation, and falling into a vein of lightness and scurrility, forgetting that religion is the subject, and Christians and scholars their antagonists," &c. These things, I confess, he lays to their charge: but where is the satire? where are the exasperating expressions? the pen steeped in gall, and the uncharitable ex-

* Reply, p. 45.

pressions, for which he seems, to the Representer, but to make a serious droll? It is true enough, that to accuse men of palliating their religion, "of want of fairness, of falling into lightness, of trivial jestings, and accommodating their writings to the genius of sceptics, who divert themselves at the expense of all religion;" this I do acknowledge to be satirical, and as the persons may be upon whom it falls, exasperating. But then the satire and the sharpness lies not here in the manner of saying, but in the truth of what is said, and I hope that author does not deserve ill of these men for speaking the plain truth of them in expressions so soft and inoffensive, as if he had taken time to choose the gentlest: if they do not now represent their religion with that sincerity which one would expect from Christians, I know a great many sharper words whereby one might justly express that fault, but scarce one that has less keenness, than that they palliate. If they bring in a zealous brother ridiculing our Church, instead of defending their own, could anything be more cool than to complain of want of fairness and civility, than to resent their falling into a vein of lightness and scurrility, and to put them in mind that religion is the subject, and Christians and scholars their antagonists. If this be turned into matter of accusation too, we have an ill time of it, who must have to do with men that can well enough endure to do all these things, but cannot endure to hear of it again, though in the mildest way of representing it: had that author, whose books the Representer may be ashamed to acknowledge that he has read, had he, I say, written in the Representer's strain, had he said anything like making the King's capital city a Protestant Sodom, and the fires of Southwark and the Temple our evangelical proofs against the Papists, and the preacher's theme the "alarum to keep the drowsy flock from nodding;" had he set the Representer any example of such unhandsome levities as these are, and which, to say no more, are hardly tolerable upon the stage, then indeed the justice of his charge would not have borne him out in his management of it; but when that excellent man had charged them with no more than what he has terribly proved, and that is palliating, or with no more than what is flagrant in their last pieces, *viz.* "want of fairness and civility," &c. in a word, with no more than what is true; and this without virulency, or so much as levity of expression (for which I leave the world to judge by those very phrases which the Representer has picked out of his last book), and yet for this, his pen must

be said to be steeped in gall, and his antagonists exposed under the most odious character imaginable. I might well make more, but I cannot make less of it, than that some men are very much exasperated by being shewn to themselves.

And now, if I had a mind to take every occasion, he has given no small one by bringing in that parable in the Scripture, of the trees choosing a king, to illustrate his own seriousness in the drolling sermon he composed for the zealous brother : but I forbear at present, because he pretends to forbearance too.

For the advice that he has given the forementioned author, I do acknowledge that it were very good, but that it wants pertinence and occasion ; and for that reason looks more like an unjust accusation, than a charitable admonition. But if he thinks good counsel is always to be received with thanks ; I say to him what he says to our Expositor, " let him turn to such of his own communion who have given bad examples in the business of misrepresenting." And let him too that gives good advice take it also ; which though it be not so easy, it will yet be better for him ; but above all things " let him endeavour that their arguments and methods for the defeating of Protestants, be not such as any Jew may take to strike at Christianity, and every atheist to make a shame of all religion." Which advice is so good, that it is pity it should be lost upon those that need it not, and therefore I desire him to recommend it to the author of the Parallel between the doctrine of the Trinity and the doctrine of Transubstantiation. Let the Representer do his duty well upon this occasion, and I can hereafter tell him of others wherein his interest will prevail more than mine.

But because the Representer is sincerely of our Expositor's mind, " that this way of handling controversies, doth rather exasperate than heal our divisions," I will tell him an effectual way to prevent it. Let them represent their religion like men that are not afraid to let the people know the bottom of it ; and when they offer to defend their doctrines, let them not pretend to go on with their first undertaking, when they leave it, and fall into invectives against their adversaries : for if they would honestly confess that their business is to make us look as odiously as they can, they should, for me, go on in this way till they are weary, without any recrimination. If the Representer desires also that these controversies may have an end, let him persuade his friends not to produce testimonies

out of the Fathers for Popery, without taking notice of the answers that have been so often made to them : which advice, if it had been given and taken, we had not seen the *Consensus Veterum*, and the *Nubes Testium*. Let them not furnish out books with arguments that have been often offered, and as often answered ; but take the controvesy where it was left by their predecessors and ours, and then go on with it if they can ; which had been very good advice to Mr. Clenche. Let them not begin all over again, to spin out the time, and to make our disputes endless : let them write and do like men that hope to gain upon the world by reason and argument. As for our parts, we shall be careful to follow his last advice, and to prove ourselves true members of the Church of England, not only by maintaining the truth which she hath taught us, but by practising those principles and that loyalty which we preach ; that as we are sensible to whom we owe the liberty we enjoy, so we may approve ourselves not altogether unworthy of it, but be always able to give some good account of ourselves, with respect to these controversies, both to God and the King.

END OF VOL. XIII.

